arXiv:hep-th/0107090v2 20 Sep 2001

ROM2F-01/24
hep-th/0107090

Geometric Couplings and Brane Supersymmetry Breaking

Gianfranco Pradisi and Fabio Riccioni

Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma "Tor Vergata"
I.N.F.N. - Sezione di Roma "Tor Vergata",
Via della Ricerca Scientifica , 1 00133 Roma ITALY

Abstract

Orientifold vacua allow the simultaneous presence of supersymmetric bulks, with one or more gravitinos, and non-supersymmetric combinations of BPS branes. This "brane supersymmetry breaking" raises the issue of consistency for the resulting gravitino couplings, and Dudas and Mourad recently provided convincing arguments to this effect for the ten-dimensional $USp(32)$ model. These rely on a non-linear realization of local supersymmetry *à la* Volkov-Akulov, although no gravitino mass term is present, and the couplings have a nice geometrical interpretation in terms of "dressed" bulk fields, aside from a Wess-Zumino-like term, resulting from the supersymmetrization of the Chern-Simons couplings. Here we show that *all* couplings can be given a geometrical interpretation, albeit in the dual 6-form model, whose bulk includes a Wess-Zumino term, so that the non-geometric ones are in fact demanded by the geometrization of their duals. We also determine the low-energy couplings for six-dimensional (1,0) models with brane supersymmetry breaking. Since these include both Chern-Simons and Wess-Zumino terms, only the resulting field equations are geometrical, aside from contributions due to vectors of supersymmetric sectors.

(July, 2001)

1 Introduction

Orientifold vacua [1, 2] allow the simultaneous presence of supersymmetric bulks, with one or more gravitinos, and non-supersymmetric combinations of BPS branes. The resulting "brane supersymmetry breaking" can be realized in stable configurations, in ten dimensions with only anti-$D9$ ($\bar{D}9$) branes [3], and in six and four dimensions, up to T-dualities, with tachyon-free combinations of $D9$ branes and anti-$D5$ ($\bar{D}5$) branes [4]. Since this is only one of the options offered by this class of models for the breaking of supersymmetry, a fundamental issue in attempting to relate string theory to low-energy physics, it is instructive to briefly review our current knowledge in this respect.

In perturbative string vacua, one has actually four options for supersymmetry breaking. The first is to break supersymmetry from the start, so that no gravitinos are present, and the resulting models, descendants of the type-0 models of [5], have in general tachyonic modes [6], although a special Klein-bottle projection, suggested by the WZW constructions of [7], leads to the $0'$B model [8], that is free of tachyons, a property shared by its compactifications [9] and neatly rooted in its brane content [10]. The second option is the Scherk-Schwarz mechanism [11], in which the breaking, induced by deformed harmonic expansions in the internal space, is at the compactification scale. In this setting, widely studied in the context of models of oriented closed strings [12], the presence of branes allows the new option of correlating the Scherk-Schwarz deformations to the brane geometry, giving rise, in particular, to the phenomenon of "brane supersymmetry", whereby one or more residual global supersymmetries are left, to lowest order, for the brane modes [13]. The third option, magnetic deformations [14], resorts to the different magnetic moments of the various fields to induce supersymmetry breaking [15], again at the compactification scale, but the resulting vacua, that have also T-dual descriptions in terms of branes at angles [16], generally contain tachyons [17], aside from some special instanton-like stable configurations that recover supersymmetry, albeit with gauge groups of reduced rank [18]. Finally, one has the option of brane supersymmetry breaking [3, 4], made possible by the presence of two types of O-planes. Together with the conventional O_+, with negative tension and negative R-R charge, there are indeed additional BPS objects, the O_- planes, with positive tension and positive R-R charge, and while the two can coexist in supersymmetric Klein-bottle projections, the saturation of the O_- charge requires the presence of anti-branes, with the result that supersymmetry is broken on the latter *at the string scale*. It is the rigidity of the breaking scale, together with some special features of the resulting low-energy effective field theories, that typically do not allow a gravitino mass term, that makes the explicit construction of the goldstino couplings quite interesting in this case.

Dudas and Mourad [19] have recently shown that, in the simplest model with brane supersymmetry breaking, the $USp(32)$ model of [3], the low-energy gravitino couplings reflect a non-linear realization of local supersymmetry *à la* Volkov-Akulov, along the lines of [20], and their work is the starting point for our considerations. Let us stress that, while all branes, including the supersymmetric ones, result in the non-linear realization *à la* Born-Infeld of the supersymmetries broken by their presence, here one arrives at a complete breaking, and the peculiarity with respect to lower-dimensional settings for the super-Higgs mechanism is the absence of a gravitino mass term. This feature is common to the case analyzed in [19] and to the lower-dimensional models of [4], that we shall also discuss in this paper. Actually, all these configurations, even the supersymmetric ones, can accommodate additional brane-antibrane pairs of identical dimensions, that are to be spatially separated in order to lift the resulting tachyons. These additional pairs provide in their own right additional ways to realize brane supersymmetry breaking, but have clearly potential tachyon instabilities [21] for their geometric moduli, in view of the mutual attraction of identical branes and antibranes. We shall thus confine our attention to the “minimal” configurations of [3, 4] demanded by tadpole cancellation, although the other pairs could be described along similar lines. Still, we should mention that non-minimal brane-antibrane configurations are also quite interesting, and are currently the object of a considerable activity as a string setting for brane-world extensions of the Standard Model [17, 22].

All models with brane supersymmetry breaking contain a candidate goldstino among their brane modes, and in [19] Dudas and Mourad indeed constructed the low-energy couplings of the goldstino for the ten-dimensional $USp(32)$ Sugimoto model of [3] up to quartic fermionic terms. These were all shown to be of a geometric nature, being induced by the dressing of bulk fields with additional terms depending on the goldstino in all their couplings to the non-supersymmetric brane matter, aside from some Wess-Zumino-like terms resulting from the supersymmetrization of the Chern-Simons couplings. The geometric nature of the dressing implies that non-linear supersymmetries of the matter sector take the form of gaugino-dependent general coordinate transformations. In this paper, we extend the work of [19], showing that, up to quartic fermionic terms, the *whole* low energy effective Lagrangian of the Sugimoto model, including the Chern-Simons couplings, has a geometric nature when expressed in terms of the dual 6-form gauge field, rather than of the more familiar 2-form. The starting point in this case is thus the low-energy supergravity built long ago by Chamseddine [23], rather than the model of [24]. The ten-dimensional Chern-Simons terms become in this way higher derivative couplings that, as such, do not appear in the low-energy effective action, while a Wess-Zumino term must be added, and this can be simply "geometrized" dressing the six-form along the lines of [19]. We also extend the analysis of the low-energy effective action to six dimensional models with brane supersymmetry breaking. The starting point in this case is provided by the low-energy (1,0) effective actions of [25, 26, 27, 28, 29]. These, however, include both Wess-Zumino and Chern-Simons couplings for the gauge fields, and as a result have the subtle feature of embodying reducible gauge anomalies to be canceled by fermion loops. This peculiar feature, not present in the earlier constructions of [30] motivated by perturbative heterotic strings, links these constructions to the Wess-Zumino conditions for the anomalies, with the end result that many familiar properties of current algebra find in this case an explicit local realization. In order to write a covariant action for the resulting (anti)self-dual 3-forms, we shall resort to the method of Pasti-Sorokin-Tonin [31], both for the (1,0) couplings of vector and tensor multiplets of [25] and for the additional hypermultiplet couplings obtained by one of us in [29] completing the results of [32]. The remaining couplings are determined requiring that supersymmetry be non-linearly realized as in the ten-dimensional case, but the simultaneous presence of Chern-Simons and Wess-Zumino terms produces a novel effect. Indeed, while the action is still determined by the underlying geometrical structure, as is often the case with Wess-Zumino terms, only the field equations are geometrical in this case, aside from anomalous terms that arise in the presence of vectors from both supersymmetric and non-supersymmetric sectors.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we review some basic facts on type-I vacua with brane supersymmetry breaking, referring to the Sugimoto model [3] and to the simplest lower-dimensional model with $D9$ and $\bar{D}5$ branes, the T^4/Z_2 orientifold of [4]. In Section 3 we review the low-energy effective couplings built by Dudas and Mourad [19] for the ten-dimensional model and exhibit their geometric nature in terms of the 6-form potential. Section 4 is devoted to the six-dimensional non-linear realizations, and in order to make the paper self-contained, it includes a brief review of the results of [25, 26, 27, 28, 29], limitedly to the terms at most quadratic in the fermions needed for our construction. Finally, Section 5 contains our conclusions.

2 Models with brane supersymmetry breaking

In the following sections we shall describe the low-energy goldstino couplings for what are essentially the two classes of string realizations of brane supersymmetry breaking. The first, defined in ten-dimensional space time, is the Sugimoto model of [3], while the second is a peculiar T^4/Z_2 orientifold, where the Klein-bottle projection is altered in a way reminiscent of the WZW constructions in [7]. The ten-dimensional model involves $\bar{D}9$ branes and O_- planes, and results from an unoriented projection obtained combining the world-sheet parity Ω with $(-1)^{F_s}$, where F_s denotes the space-time fermion number. Still, the resulting Klein-bottle projection is identical to the usual one for the Green-Schwarz $SO(32)$ superstring [33]

$$\mathcal{K} = \frac{1}{2}\left(V_8 - S_8\right) , \tag{2.1}$$

here expressed, as in [6], in terms of level-one $so(8)$ characters while leaving the modular integration implicit. The difference between the two models lies in the open sector, and in particular in the Möbius amplitude, that reflects the relative values of tension and charge for branes and O-planes. Thus, for the $SO(32)$ model

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} &= \frac{N^2}{2}\,(V_8 - S_8)\ , \\ \mathcal{M} &= -\frac{N}{2}\,(\hat{V}_8 - \hat{S}_8)\ , \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

while for the $USp(32)$ model

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} &= \frac{N^2}{2}\,(V_8 - S_8)\ , \\ \mathcal{M} &= \frac{N}{2}\,(\hat{V}_8 + \hat{S}_8)\ , \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

again in the compact notation of [6], with real "hatted" characters for the Möbius amplitudes. In both cases R-R tadpole cancellation fixes $N = 32$, but while in the former 32 $D9$ branes cancel the O_+ background charge and tension, in the latter 32 $\bar{D}9$ branes cancel only the opposite O_- charge, leaving a resulting dilaton tadpole. The massless spectrum contains a vector in the adjoint representation of $USp(32)$ and a spinor in the antisymmetric representation. This, however, is not irreducible, but can be decomposed into the **495** and a singlet: it is exactly this singlet that plays the role of the goldstino in the low energy effective action. Supersymmetry is broken in the open sector, but the spectrum is free of anomalies, and the dilaton tadpole that survives signals the impossibility of vacuum configurations with the maximal ten-dimensional symmetry. Vacuum configurations with a lower, nine-dimensional, symmetry are however possible, as shown in [34].

Lower dimensional models with brane supersymmetry breaking were built in [4]. As anticipated, they result from Klein-bottle projections modified in a way reminiscent of what done in WZW models in [7]. In Z_2 orbifold compactifications, and in general for orbifolds with order-two group generators, one has the option of antisymmetrizing some twisted sectors or, equivalently, of inverting tensions and charges for the corresponding $O5$-planes. This requires that $D9$ branes be accompanied by suitable stacks of $\bar{D}5$ branes, with a resulting brane supersymmetry breaking. In the six-dimensional T^4/Z_2 orientifold, the torus partition function

$$\mathcal{T} \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\mid V_4O_4 + O_4V_4 - S_4S_4 - C_4C_4 \mid^2 \Lambda + \frac{1}{2}\mid V_4O_4 - O_4V_4 + S_4S_4 - C_4C_4 \mid^2 \left| \frac{2\eta}{\theta_2} \right|^4$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+ \quad \frac{1}{2} \mid O_4C_4 + V_4S_4 - S_4O_4 - C_4V_4 \mid^2 \left|\frac{2\eta}{\theta_4}\right|^4 \\
&+ \quad \frac{1}{2} \mid O_4C_4 - V_4S_4 - S_4O_4 + C_4V_4 \mid^2 \left|\frac{2\eta}{\theta_3}\right|^4
\end{aligned} \tag{2.4}
$$

can be expressed in terms of the Narain lattice Λ and of the $so(4)$ level-one characters O_4, V_4, S_4 and C_4, again omitting the modular measure and the inert contributions. Two choices for the unoriented projection compatible with the crosscap constraint of [7] are described by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{K} \;=\; & \frac{1}{4}\Big\{ \, (\, V_4O_4 - O_4V_4 + S_4S_4 - C_4C_4 \,) \, (P + W) \\
& + \; 2\epsilon \times 16 \, (\, O_4C_4 + V_4S_4 - S_4O_4 - C_4V_4 \,) \left(\frac{\eta}{\theta_4} \right)^2 \Big\} \, ,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.5}
$$

where P (W) indicates the momentum (winding) lattice sum and $\epsilon = \pm 1$. At the massless level, $\epsilon = 1$ gives $N = (1,0)$ supergravity with 1 tensor multiplet and 20 hypermultiplets, while $\epsilon = -1$ gives $N = (1,0)$ supergravity with 17 tensor multiplets and 4 hypermultiplets. These closed spectra are both supersymmetric, but the latter projection introduces $O9_+$ planes and $O5_-$ planes, and this leads to an open sector with brane supersymmetry breaking. This is clearly spelled by the massless contributions to the transverse Klein-bottle amplitude, that can be read from

$$
\tilde{\mathcal{K}}_0 = \frac{2^5}{4}\Big\{ \, (\, V_4O_4 - C_4C_4 \,) \left(\sqrt{v} + \epsilon \frac{1}{\sqrt{v}} \right)^2 + (\, O_4V_4 - S_4S_4 \,) \left(\sqrt{v} - \epsilon \frac{1}{\sqrt{v}} \right)^2 \Big\} \, , \tag{2.6}
$$

where the reflection coefficients are interchanged in the two cases. For $\epsilon = -1$, all R-R tadpoles can be canceled by 32 $D9$ branes and 32 $\bar{D}5$ branes, since the latter indeed revert all the 9-5 R-R contributions to the transverse-channel annulus amplitude. The result is

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathcal{A}} \;=\; & \frac{2^{-5}}{4} \Big\{ \, (\, V_4O_4 + O_4V_4 - S_4S_4 - C_4C_4 \,)\Big(\, N^2 v W + \frac{D^2 P}{v} \, \Big) \\
& + \; 2ND \, (\, V_4O_4 - O_4V_4 - S_4S_4 + C_4C_4 \,) \left(\frac{2\eta}{\theta_2} \right)^2 \\
& + \; 16 \, (\, O_4C_4 + V_4S_4 - S_4O_4 - C_4V_4 \,)\Big(R_N^2 + R_D^2 \, \Big)\left(\frac{\eta}{\theta_4} \right)^2 \\
& + \; 8R_NR_D \, (\, V_4S_4 - O_4C_4 - S_4O_4 + C_4V_4 \,) \left(\frac{\eta}{\theta_3} \right)^2 \Big\} \, ,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.7}
$$

and from $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$, by standard methods, it is straightforward to obtain the open spectra, encoded in the direct-channel amplitudes

$$
\mathcal{A} \;=\; \frac{1}{4} \Big\{ \, (\, V_4O_4 + O_4V_4 - S_4S_4 - C_4C_4 \,) \, (\, N^2 P + D^2 W \,)
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+ \; 2ND \; (\; O_4S_4 + V_4C_4 - C_4O_4 - S_4V_4 \;) \left(\frac{\eta}{\theta_4} \right)^2 \\
&+ \; (\; R_N^2 + R_D^2 \;) \; (\; V_4O_4 - O_4V_4 + S_4S_4 - C_4C_4 \;) \left(\frac{2\eta}{\theta_2} \right)^2 \\
&+ \; 2R_NR_D \; (\; V_4C_4 - O_4S_4 + S_4V_4 - C_4O_4 \;) \left(\frac{\eta}{\theta_3} \right)^2 \Bigg\}
\end{aligned} \tag{2.8}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M} = \; & - \; \frac{1}{4} \Bigg\{ NP \; (\; \hat{O}_4\hat{V}_4 + \hat{V}_4\hat{O}_4 - \hat{S}_4\hat{S}_4 - \hat{C}_4\hat{C}_4 \;) \\
& - \; DW \; (\; \hat{O}_4\hat{V}_4 + \hat{V}_4\hat{O}_4 + \hat{S}_4\hat{S}_4 + \hat{C}_4\hat{C}_4 \;) \\
& - \; N \; (\; \hat{O}_4\hat{V}_4 - \hat{V}_4\hat{O}_4 - \hat{S}_4\hat{S}_4 + \hat{C}_4\hat{C}_4 \;) \left(\frac{2\hat{\eta}}{\hat{\theta}_2} \right)^2 \\
& + \; D \; (\; \hat{O}_4\hat{V}_4 - \hat{V}_4\hat{O}_4 + \hat{S}_4\hat{S}_4 - \hat{C}_4\hat{C}_4 \;) \left(\frac{2\hat{\eta}}{\hat{\theta}_2} \right)^2 \Bigg\} \; .
\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}
$$

The R-R tadpole cancellation conditions require

$$
\begin{aligned}
N \;&=\; D \;=\; 32 \quad , \\
R_N \;&=\; R_D \;=\; 0 \quad ,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}
$$

and allow a parametrization in terms of real Chan-Paton multiplicities of the form $N = n_1 + n_2$, $D = d_1 + d_2$, $R_N = n_1 - n_2$ and $R_D = d_1 - d_2$, with $n_1 = n_2 = d_1 = d_2 = 16$. The massless spectrum can be extracted from

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_0 + \mathcal{M}_0 \;=\; & [\; \frac{n_1(n_1-1)}{2} + \frac{n_2(n_2-1)}{2} + \frac{d_1(d_1+1)}{2} + \frac{d_2(d_2+1)}{2} \;] \; V_4O_4 \\
- \; & [\; \frac{n_1(n_1-1)}{2} + \frac{n_2(n_2-1)}{2} + \frac{d_1(d_1-1)}{2} + \frac{d_2(d_2-1)}{2} \;] \; C_4C_4 \\
+ \; & (\; n_1d_2 + n_2d_1 \;) \; O_4S_4 - (\; n_1d_1 + n_2d_2 \;) \; C_4O_4 \\
+ \; & (\; n_1n_2 + d_1d_2 \;) \; (\; O_4V_4 - S_4S_4 \;) \quad ,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.11}
$$

and the gauge group is thus $[SO(16) \times SO(16)]_9 \times [USp(16) \times USp(16)]_{\bar{5}}$. Supersymmetry, exact in the 9-9 sector, where the vector multiplets of the two $SO(16)$ are accompanied by a hypermultiplet in the $(\mathbf{16}, \mathbf{16}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})$, is broken on the $\bar{D}5$ branes, where the gauge vectors of the two $USp(16)$ are in the adjoint representation while the left-handed Weyl fermions are again in reducible antisymmetric representations, now the $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{120}, \mathbf{1})$ and the $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{120})$. In addition, there are four scalars and two right-handed Weyl fermions in the $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{16}, \mathbf{16})$, as well as two scalars in the $(\mathbf{16}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{16})$, two scalars in the $(\mathbf{1},\mathbf{16},\mathbf{16},\mathbf{1})$ and symplectic Majorana-Weyl fermions in the $(\mathbf{16},\mathbf{1},\mathbf{16},\mathbf{1})$ and $(\mathbf{1},\mathbf{16},\mathbf{1},\mathbf{16})$. This model is free of gauge and gravitational anomalies and provides an example of type-I vacuum with a stable non-BPS configuration of BPS branes. As in the ten-dimensional $USp(32)$ model, the breaking of supersymmetry yields a tree-level potential for the NS-NS moduli related to the uncanceled tadpoles, the dilaton and the internal volume in this case, that reflects the positive tension resulting from the $O5_-$ planes and the anti-branes.

Similar considerations apply to generic Z_N orientifolds in six and four dimensions, as well as to more complicated compactifications, to wit freely acting orbifolds or non-geometric examples. From the low-energy point of view, all models with brane supersymmetry breaking exhibit in their spectra a gauge singlet on the non supersymmetric branes, with the right quantum numbers to be a goldstino. As we shall see in the next sections, these goldstinos play the role of Volkov-Akulov fields that allow consistent couplings of the gravitinos to the non supersymmetric matter. Supersymmetry is thus linearly realized in the bulk and on some branes, while it is non-linearly realized on other (anti)branes.

3 Low-energy couplings for the Sugimoto model

This section builds on [19], where the low-energy effective action for the $USp(32)$ model was constructed, to lowest order in the fermi fields, requiring that supersymmetry be non-linearly realized on the $\bar{D}9$ branes, and thus obtaining consistent couplings for the gravitino. Our aim is to show how *all* the couplings of [19] can be written in a geometric form.

Let us start by reviewing the work of [19], in a slightly different notation, working in the Einstein frame with metric signature $(+,-,...,-)$. As we have seen in the previous section, the Sugimoto model results from a different IIB orientifold projection with respect to the one leading to the type-I $SO(32)$ theory. The closed spectrum is identical in the two cases, and comprises at the massless level the (1,0) supergravity multiplet, with the vielbein $e_\mu{}^m$, a 2-form $B_{\mu\nu}$, the dilaton ϕ, a left-handed gravitino ψ_μ and a right-handed dilatino χ, while the open sector describes a $USp(32)$ gauge group, whose gauge boson A_μ is accompanied by a massless Majorana-Weyl spinor in the *reducible* antisymmetric representation, that contains a spinor λ in the **495** and a singlet θ. Dudas and Mourad identified in [19] this singlet as the goldstino of supersymmetry, that is non-linearly realized on the brane modes, consistently with its breaking at the string scale. Starting from this, they constructed the low-energy effective action for the Sugimoto model up to quartic terms in the spinors.

Let us briefly review how a single spinor can be treated *à la* Volkov-Akulov [20] as a goldstino of global supersymmetry. Let us restrict our attention to the ten dimensional case, considering a Majorana-Weyl fermion θ with the supersymmetry transformation

$$\delta\theta = \epsilon - \frac{i}{2}(\bar{\epsilon}\gamma^\mu\theta)\partial_\mu\theta. \tag{3.1}$$

The commutator of two such transformations is a translation,

$$[\delta_1, \delta_2]\theta = -i(\bar{\epsilon}_2\gamma^\mu\epsilon_1)\partial_\mu\theta \quad , \tag{3.2}$$

and thus eq. (3.1) provides a realization of supersymmetry. In order to write a Lagrangian for θ invariant under eq. (3.1), let us define the 1-form

$$e_\mu{}^m = \delta_\mu^m - \frac{i}{2}(\bar{\theta}\gamma^m\partial_\mu\theta) \quad , \tag{3.3}$$

whose supersymmetry transformation is

$$\delta e^m = -L_\xi e^m \quad , \tag{3.4}$$

with L_ξ the Lie derivative with respect to

$$\xi_\mu = -\frac{i}{2}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_\mu\epsilon) \quad . \tag{3.5}$$

The action of supersymmetry on e is thus a general coordinate transformation, with a parameter depending on θ, and therefore

$$\mathcal{L} = -\det e \tag{3.6}$$

is clearly an invariant Lagrangian. Expanding the determinant, one can see that the energy has a positive vacuum expectation value, and supersymmetry is thus spontaneously broken. Using the same technique, for a generic field A that transforms under supersymmetry as

$$\delta A = -L_\xi A \quad , \tag{3.7}$$

defining the induced metric as $g_{\mu\nu} = e_\mu{}^m e_{\nu m}$, a supersymmetric Lagrangian in flat space is determined by the substitution

$$\mathcal{L}(\eta, A) \to e\mathcal{L}(g, A) \quad . \tag{3.8}$$

We can now review the results of [19], and to this end we begin by considering the Lagrangian for the closed sector

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-1}\mathcal{L}_{closed} = & - \frac{1}{4}R + \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\phi\partial^\mu\phi + \frac{1}{6}e^{-2\phi}H_{\mu\nu\rho}H^{\mu\nu\rho} \\ & - \frac{i}{2}(\bar{\psi}_\mu\gamma^{\mu\nu\rho}D_\nu\psi_\rho) + \frac{i}{2}(\bar{\chi}\gamma^\mu D_\mu\chi) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\bar{\psi}_\mu\gamma^\nu\gamma^\mu\chi)\partial_\nu\phi \\ & - \frac{i}{12\sqrt{2}}e^{-\phi}H_{\mu\nu\rho}(\bar{\psi}_\sigma\gamma^{\sigma\delta\mu\nu\rho}\psi_\delta) + \frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}}e^{-\phi}H_{\mu\nu\rho}(\bar{\psi}^\mu\gamma^\nu\psi^\rho) \\ & + \frac{1}{12}e^{-\phi}H_{\mu\nu\rho}(\bar{\psi}_\sigma\gamma^{\mu\nu\rho}\gamma^\sigma\chi) \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

that provides a linear realization of the minimal (1,0) ten-dimensional supersymmetry, and is thus invariant under the local supersymmetry transformations

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta e_\mu{}^m = -i(\bar{\epsilon}\gamma^m\psi_\mu) \quad , \\ & \delta B_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}e^\phi(\bar{\epsilon}\gamma_{[\mu}\psi_{\nu]}) - \frac{1}{4}e^\phi(\bar{\epsilon}\gamma_{\mu\nu}\chi) \quad , \\ & \delta\phi = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\bar{\epsilon}\chi) \quad , \\ & \delta\psi_\mu = D_\mu\epsilon + \frac{1}{24\sqrt{2}}e^{-\phi}H^{\nu\rho\sigma}\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\epsilon - \frac{3}{8\sqrt{2}}e^{-\phi}H_{\mu\nu\rho}\gamma^{\nu\rho}\epsilon \quad , \\ & \delta\chi = -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}\partial_\mu\phi\gamma^\mu\epsilon - \frac{i}{12}e^{-\phi}H^{\mu\nu\rho}\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho}\epsilon \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

In the supersymmetric case, when these bulk modes are coupled to a gauge multiplet supported on the 9-branes and containing a vector A_μ and a left-handed gaugino λ both in the adjoint representation of $SO(32)$, supersymmetry requires that the 3-form $H_{\mu\nu\rho}$ include a Chern-Simons coupling, so that

$$H_{\mu\nu\rho} = 3\partial_{[\mu}B_{\nu\rho]} + \sqrt{2}\omega_{\mu\nu\rho} \quad , \tag{3.11}$$

where $\omega_{\mu\nu\rho}$ is the Chern-Simons 3-form defined as

$$\omega = AdA - \frac{2i}{3}A^3 \quad , \tag{3.12}$$

and this leads to the modified Bianchi identity

$$\partial_{[\mu}H_{\nu\rho\sigma]} = \frac{3}{\sqrt{2}}tr(F_{[\mu\nu}F_{\rho\sigma]}) \quad . \tag{3.13}$$

The Lagrangian for supergravity coupled to vector multiplets is then [24]

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-1}\mathcal{L} = & - \frac{1}{4}R + \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\phi\partial^\mu\phi + \frac{1}{6}e^{-2\phi}H_{\mu\nu\rho}H^{\mu\nu\rho} - \frac{1}{2}e^{-\phi}tr(F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}) \\ & - \frac{i}{2}(\bar{\psi}_\mu\gamma^{\mu\nu\rho}D_\nu\psi_\rho) + \frac{i}{2}(\bar{\chi}\gamma^\mu D_\mu\chi) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\bar{\psi}_\mu\gamma^\nu\gamma^\mu\chi)\partial_\nu\phi \\ & - \frac{i}{12\sqrt{2}}e^{-\phi}H_{\mu\nu\rho}(\bar{\psi}_\sigma\gamma^{\sigma\delta\mu\nu\rho}\psi_\delta) + \frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}}e^{-\phi}H_{\mu\nu\rho}(\bar{\psi}^\mu\gamma^\nu\psi^\rho) \\ & + \frac{1}{12}e^{-\phi}H_{\mu\nu\rho}(\bar{\psi}_\sigma\gamma^{\mu\nu\rho}\gamma^\sigma\chi) + itr(\bar{\lambda}\gamma^\mu D_\mu\lambda) \\ & - \frac{1}{2}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\phi}tr[F^{\mu\nu}(\bar{\lambda}\gamma_{\mu\nu}\chi)] + \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\phi}tr[F^{\mu\nu}(\bar{\lambda}\gamma_\rho\gamma_{\mu\nu}\psi^\rho)] \\ & - \frac{i}{6\sqrt{2}}e^{-\phi}H^{\mu\nu\rho}tr(\bar{\lambda}\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho}\lambda) \ , \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

up to quartic terms in the fermions. The supersymmetry transformations of the bulk fields $e_\mu{}^m$, ϕ, ψ_μ and χ are as before, while for the gauge multiplet

$$\begin{aligned} \delta A_\mu &= -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}e^{\frac{1}{2}\phi}(\bar{\epsilon}\gamma_\mu\lambda) \quad , \\ \delta\lambda &= -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\phi}F^{\mu\nu}\gamma_{\mu\nu}\epsilon \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

Gauge invariance of H requires that under vector gauge transformations B transform as

$$\delta B = -\sqrt{2}tr(\Lambda dA) \ , \tag{3.16}$$

and in order that gauge and supersymmetry transformations commute, up to a tensor gauge transformation, one has to add a term to the supersymmetry variation of $B_{\mu\nu}$, obtaining

$$\delta B_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}e^\phi(\bar{\epsilon}\gamma_{[\mu}\psi_{\nu]}) - \frac{1}{4}e^\phi(\bar{\epsilon}\gamma_{\mu\nu}\chi) + 2\sqrt{2}tr(A_{[\mu}\delta A_{\nu]}) \quad . \tag{3.17}$$

In order to couple the Lagrangian (3.9) to non-supersymmetric matter, one must construct from the fields of the supergravity multiplet quantities whose supersymmetry variations are general coordinate transformations with the parameter ξ_μ of eq. (3.5). We thus define

$$\hat{\phi} = \phi + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\bar{\theta}\chi) + \frac{i}{24\sqrt{2}} e^{-\phi}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho}\theta)H^{\mu\nu\rho} \tag{3.18}$$

so that

$$\delta\hat{\phi} = -\xi^\mu \partial_\mu \hat{\phi} = \delta_{gct}\hat{\phi} \tag{3.19}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{e}_\mu{}^m &= e_\mu{}^m + i(\bar{\theta}\gamma^m\psi_\mu) - \frac{i}{2}(\bar{\theta}\gamma^m D_\mu\theta) - \frac{i}{48\sqrt{2}} e_\mu{}^m e^{-\phi}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\nu\rho\sigma}\theta)H^{\nu\rho\sigma} \\ &+ \frac{i}{16\sqrt{2}} e^{-\phi}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho}\theta)H^{m\nu\rho} + \frac{3i}{16\sqrt{2}} e^{-\phi}(\bar{\theta}\gamma^{m\nu\rho}\theta)H_{\mu\nu\rho} \end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

so that

$$\delta\hat{e}_\mu{}^m = \delta_{gct}\hat{e}_\mu{}^m + \Lambda^m{}_n \hat{e}_\mu{}^n \quad , \tag{3.21}$$

where the parameter of the local Lorentz transformation is

$$\Lambda^{mn} = \frac{i}{2}(\bar{\theta}\gamma^\rho\epsilon)\omega_\rho{}^{mn} + \frac{i}{24\sqrt{2}} e^{-\phi}(\bar{\theta}\gamma^{mn\nu\rho\sigma}\epsilon)H_{\nu\rho\sigma} + \frac{3i}{4\sqrt{2}} e^{-\phi}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_\rho\epsilon)H^{\rho mn} \quad . \tag{3.22}$$

In constructing a Lagrangian invariant under non-linear supersymmetry that couples supergravity to non-supersymmetric matter, it is important to notice that eq. (3.11) still holds, because of anomaly cancellation. For the same reason, the variation of B is still given by eq. (3.17), once one uses the new transformation for A_μ,

$$\delta A_\mu = F_{\mu\nu}\xi^\nu \quad . \tag{3.23}$$

Observe that this covariant expression for δA_μ contains the proper coordinate transformation, together with an additional gauge transformation of parameter

$$\Lambda = \xi^\mu A_\mu \quad . \tag{3.24}$$

The supersymmetry transformation of the spinor λ in the **495** of $USp(32)$ will not be taken into account in this discussion, since it contains higher-order fermi terms. One can now include [19] the kinetic term for A_μ and the dilaton tadpole in a Lagrangian that is supersymmetric up to terms quartic in the fermions, considering

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &= \mathcal{L}_{closed} - \frac{1}{2}\hat{e}e^{-\hat{\phi}}\hat{g}^{\mu\rho}\hat{g}^{\nu\sigma} tr(F_{\mu\nu}F_{\rho\sigma}) - \Lambda\hat{e}e^{\frac{3}{2}\hat{\phi}} \\ &+ ie\, tr(\bar{\lambda}\gamma^\mu D_\mu\lambda) - \frac{ie}{6\sqrt{2}} e^{-\phi}H^{\mu\nu\rho}\, tr(\bar{\lambda}\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho}\lambda) \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

where in the Sugimoto model $\Lambda = 64T_9$, with T_9 the anti-brane tension. By string considerations, one can show that the coefficient of the coupling of H to λ^2, not constrained by supersymmetry at this level, is the same as in the supersymmetric case [19]. Actually, the Lagrangian of eq. (3.25) is still not invariant under supersymmetry, since the inclusion of the Chern-Simons term and the consequent modification of the Bianchi identity for H generate contributions proportional to $F \wedge F$ in the variation of $\mathcal{L}_{closed}$. Up to higher order fermionic terms, however, these are exactly canceled by the variation of the additional terms

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{6!\sqrt{2}}\epsilon^{\mu_1\ldots\mu_6\mu\nu\rho\sigma}[\frac{3i}{\sqrt{2}}e^{-\phi}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_5}\psi_{\mu_6}) - \frac{1}{4}e^{-\phi}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_6}\chi)\\
&+\frac{i}{8\sqrt{2}}e^{-2\phi}\partial_\tau\phi(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_6}{}^{\tau}\theta) - \frac{3i}{2\sqrt{2}}e^{-\phi}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_5}D_{\mu_6}\theta)\\
&-\frac{3i}{8}e^{-2\phi}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_5\tau\delta}\theta)H_{\mu_6}{}^{\tau\delta} - \frac{5i}{2}e^{-2\phi}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\mu_1\mu_2\mu_3}\theta)H_{\mu_4\mu_5\mu_6}]tr(F_{\mu\nu}F_{\rho\sigma}) \quad . \qquad (3.26)
\end{aligned}$$

To summarize, up to quartic fermionic terms the Lagrangian is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L} \;&=\; \mathcal{L}_{closed} - \frac{1}{2}\hat{e}e^{-\hat{\phi}}\hat{g}^{\mu\rho}\hat{g}^{\nu\sigma}tr(F_{\mu\nu}F_{\rho\sigma}) - \Lambda\hat{e}e^{\frac{3}{2}\hat{\phi}}\\
&+\; ie\,tr(\bar{\lambda}\gamma^{\mu}D_{\mu}\lambda) - \frac{ie}{6\sqrt{2}}e^{-\phi}H^{\mu\nu\rho}\,tr(\bar{\lambda}\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho}\lambda)\\
&+\; \frac{1}{6!\sqrt{2}}\epsilon^{\mu_1\ldots\mu_6\mu\nu\rho\sigma}[\frac{3i}{\sqrt{2}}e^{-\phi}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_5}\psi_{\mu_6}) - \frac{1}{4}e^{-\phi}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_6}\chi)\\
&+\; \frac{i}{8\sqrt{2}}e^{-2\phi}\partial_\tau\phi(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_6}{}^{\tau}\theta) - \frac{3i}{2\sqrt{2}}e^{-\phi}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_5}D_{\mu_6}\theta)\\
&-\; \frac{3i}{8}e^{-2\phi}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_5\tau\delta}\theta)H_{\mu_6}{}^{\tau\delta} - \frac{5i}{2}e^{-2\phi}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\mu_1\mu_2\mu_3}\theta)H_{\mu_4\mu_5\mu_6}]tr(F_{\mu\nu}F_{\rho\sigma}) \quad . \qquad (3.27)
\end{aligned}$$

As noticed in [19], in this formulation a geometric description for the terms in eq. (3.26) is not possible, *i.e.* it is not possible to rewrite them in terms of properly dressed bulk fields adding fermionic bilinears containing the goldstino. We can now explain why this is the case, and moreover we can also show how a geometric description is possible, after performing a duality transformation to a 6-form gauge field.

Let us again begin with standard results: performing a duality transformation on eq. (3.14), one obtains a new Lagrangian, with a 6-form rather than a 2-form, coupled to vector multiplets [23]. Technically, this is performed starting from the first-order Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} \;=\; \frac{1}{6}e^{-2\phi}H_{\mu\nu\rho}H^{\mu\nu\rho} + \frac{1}{3\cdot 6!}\epsilon^{\mu_1\ldots\mu_7\mu\nu\rho}\partial_{\mu_1}\tilde{B}_{\mu_2\ldots\mu_7}H_{\mu\nu\rho}$$

$$+ \quad \frac{1}{6!\sqrt{2}}\epsilon^{\mu_1\ldots\mu_6\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\tilde{B}_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_6}tr(F_{\mu\nu}F_{\rho\sigma}) \tag{3.28}$$

that contains both the 2-form and the 6-form. The field equation for $\tilde{B}_6$ is then exactly the Bianchi identity of eq. (3.13) for H_3, while the field equation for H_3 is

$$e^{-\phi}H_3 = e^{\phi} * \tilde{H}_7 \quad , \tag{3.29}$$

where $\tilde{H}_7 = d\tilde{B}_6$. The Lagrangian obtained substituting this relation in (3.28) and redefining $\tilde{H}_7 \to H_7$,

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{7!}e^{2\phi}H_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_7}H^{\mu_1\ldots\mu_7} + \frac{1}{6!\sqrt{2}}\epsilon^{\mu_1\ldots\mu_6\mu\nu\rho\sigma}B_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_6}tr(F_{\mu\nu}F_{\rho\sigma}) \quad , \tag{3.30}$$

shows how the Chern-Simons term in H_3 is replaced by the Wess-Zumino term $B \wedge F \wedge F$.

If one performs this duality transformation in (3.14), one ends up with the Lagrangian originally obtained by Chamseddine [23]:

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{-1}\mathcal{L} = & - \frac{1}{4}R + \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\phi\partial^\mu\phi + \frac{1}{7!}e^{2\phi}H_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_7}H^{\mu_1\ldots\mu_7} - \frac{1}{2}e^{-\phi}tr(F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}) \\
& + \frac{1}{6!\sqrt{2}}\epsilon^{\mu_1\ldots\mu_6\mu\nu\rho\sigma}B_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_6}tr(F_{\mu\nu}F_{\rho\sigma}) - \frac{i}{2}(\bar{\psi}_\mu\gamma^{\mu\nu\rho}D_\nu\psi_\rho) \\
& + \frac{i}{2}(\bar{\chi}\gamma^\mu D_\mu\chi) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\bar{\psi}_\mu\gamma^\nu\gamma^\mu\chi)\partial_\nu\phi + \frac{i}{240\sqrt{2}}e^{\phi}H^{\mu_1\ldots\mu_7}(\bar{\psi}_{\mu_1}\gamma_{\mu_2\ldots\mu_6}\psi_{\mu_7}) \\
& + \frac{i}{2\cdot 7!\sqrt{2}}e^{\phi}H^{\mu_1\ldots\mu_7}(\bar{\psi}^\mu\gamma_{\mu\mu_1\ldots\mu_7\nu}\psi^\nu) - \frac{1}{2\cdot 7!}e^{\phi}H^{\mu_1\ldots\mu_7}(\bar{\psi}^\sigma\gamma_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_7}\gamma_\sigma\chi) \\
& + itr(\bar{\lambda}\gamma^\mu D_\mu\lambda) - \frac{1}{2}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\phi}tr[F^{\mu\nu}(\bar{\lambda}\gamma_{\mu\nu}\chi)] \\
& + \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\phi}tr[F^{\mu\nu}(\bar{\lambda}\gamma_\rho\gamma_{\mu\nu}\psi^\rho)] + \frac{i}{7!\sqrt{2}}e^{\phi}H^{\mu_1\ldots\mu_7}tr(\bar{\lambda}\gamma_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_7}\lambda) \quad .
\end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

The corresponding supersymmetry transformations are obtained from eq. (3.15) performing the redefinition of eq. (3.29) on the variations of ψ_μ and χ, leaving the variations of $e_\mu{}^m$, ϕ, A_μ and λ unaffected and replacing the variation of the 2-form with

$$\delta B_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_6} = -\frac{3i}{\sqrt{2}}e^{-\phi}(\bar{\epsilon}\gamma_{[\mu_1\ldots\mu_5}\psi_{\mu_6]}) + \frac{1}{4}e^{-\phi}(\bar{\epsilon}\gamma_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_6}\chi) \quad . \tag{3.32}$$

Notice that the supersymmetry variation of the 6-form does not include a term depending on the vector field. This reflects the fact that the 6-form is inert under gauge transformations, since its field-strength does not contain a Chern-Simons form, that in this case would enter higher-derivative couplings not present in the effective supergravity.

One can now couple the supergravity multiplet expressed in terms of the 6-form to non-supersymmetric matter. In order to do this, together with $\hat{\phi}$ and $\hat{e}_\mu{}^m$ of eqs. (3.18) and (3.20), one must define the dressed 6-form

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{B}_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_6} &= B_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_6} + \frac{3i}{\sqrt{2}} e^{-\phi}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{[\mu_1\ldots\mu_5}\psi_{\mu_6]}) - \frac{1}{4} e^{-\phi}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_6}\chi) \\
&+ \frac{i}{8\sqrt{2}} e^{-2\phi}\partial_\tau\phi(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_6}{}^\tau\theta) - \frac{3i}{2\sqrt{2}} e^{-\phi}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{[\mu_1\ldots\mu_5}D_{\mu_6]}\theta) \\
&- \frac{3i}{8} e^{-2\phi}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{[\mu_1\ldots\mu_5\tau\delta}\theta)H_{\mu_6]}{}^{\tau\delta} - \frac{5i}{2} e^{-2\phi}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{[\mu_1\mu_2\mu_3}\theta)H_{\mu_4\mu_5\mu_6]} \quad , \qquad (3.33)
\end{aligned}$$

whose supersymmetry transformation is a coordinate transformation, up to an additional tensor gauge transformation of parameter

$$\Lambda_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_5} = -\frac{i}{4\sqrt{2}} e^{-\phi}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_5}\epsilon) \quad . \qquad (3.34)$$

We have intentionally written the last line of eq. (3.33) in terms of the dual 3-form, using eq. (3.29), so that the similarity with eq. (3.26) be more transparent. The Lagrangian for the closed sector,

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{-1}\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{closed} = &- \frac{1}{4}R + \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\phi\partial^\mu\phi + \frac{1}{6}e^{2\phi}H_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_7}H^{\mu_1\ldots\mu_7} \\
&- \frac{i}{2}(\bar{\psi}_\mu\gamma^{\mu\nu\rho}D_\nu\psi_\rho) + \frac{i}{2}(\bar{\chi}\gamma^\mu D_\mu\chi) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\bar{\psi}_\mu\gamma^\nu\gamma^\mu\chi)\partial_\nu\phi \\
&+ \frac{i}{240\sqrt{2}}e^\phi H^{\mu_1\ldots\mu_7}(\bar{\psi}_{\mu_1}\gamma_{\mu_2\ldots\mu_6}\psi_{\mu_7}) + \frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}7!}e^\phi H^{\mu_1\ldots\mu_7}(\bar{\psi}^\mu\gamma_{\mu\mu_1\ldots\mu_7\nu}\psi^\nu) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2\cdot 7!}e^\phi H^{\mu_1\ldots\mu_7}(\bar{\psi}^\sigma\gamma_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_7}\gamma_\sigma\chi) \qquad (3.35)
\end{aligned}$$

is simply obtained performing the duality transformation in eq. (3.9), while the same duality in eq. (3.27) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L} &= \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{closed} - \frac{1}{2}\hat{e}e^{-\hat{\phi}}\hat{g}^{\mu\rho}\hat{g}^{\nu\sigma}tr(F_{\mu\nu}F_{\rho\sigma}) - \Lambda\hat{e}e^{\frac{3}{2}\hat{\phi}} \\
&+ ietr(\bar{\lambda}\gamma^\mu D_\mu\lambda) + \frac{ie}{7!\sqrt{2}}e^\phi H^{\mu_1\ldots\mu_7}tr(\bar{\lambda}\gamma_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_7}\lambda) \\
&+ \frac{1}{6!\sqrt{2}}\epsilon^{\mu_1\ldots\mu_6\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\hat{B}_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_6}tr(F_{\mu\nu}F_{\rho\sigma}) \quad . \qquad (3.36)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that in this Lagrangian *all* terms containing the goldstino are grouped in redefinitions of the bulk fields, and therefore all couplings are written in a geometric form. This result concludes this section: for the ten-dimensional $USp(32)$ model a fully geometric description is possible if one formulates it in terms of the 6-form, since in this case the Chern-Simons term is higher derivative, and thus is not in the low-energy effective action. More precisely, as we have seen, duality maps the Chern-Simons term into the Wess-Zumino term, and this falls simply into a geometric form. The result is still valid in presence of additional brane-antibrane pairs, since the introduction of supersymmetric vectors does not modify the field strength relative to the 6-form potential in the low-energy effective action. In the dual theory, although the field strength of the 2-form is modified, no additional terms containing the goldstino have to be added to the low-energy lagangian. As we shall see, this feature is common to the six-dimensional case.

4 Geometric couplings in six-dimensional models

In this section we construct the low-energy couplings for six-dimensional type-I models with brane supersymmetry breaking [4]. As explained in Section 2, all the features of brane supersymmetry breaking are present in the T^4/Z_2 orientifold of [4], where a change of the orientifold projection leads to $D9$ branes and $\bar{D}5$ branes. The spectrum has $(1,0)$ supersymmetry in the closed and 9-9 sectors, while supersymmetry is broken in the 9-$\bar{5}$ and $\bar{5}$-$\bar{5}$ sectors. The gauge group is $SO(16)\times SO(16)$ on the $D9$ branes and $USp(16)\times USp(16)$ on the $\bar{D}5$ branes, if all the $\bar{D}5$ branes are at a fixed point.

One of the peculiar features of low-energy effective actions for six-dimensional type-I models with minimal supersymmetry is the fact that they embody reducible gauge and supersymmetry anomalies, to be canceled by fermion loops. Consequently, the Lagrangian is determined imposing the closure of the Wess-Zumino consistency conditions, rather than by the requirement of supersymmetry. The coupling of $(1,0)$ supergravity to tensor multiplets was obtained in [35] to lowest order in the fermi fields, while [30] considered a single tensor multiplet coupled to vector multiplets and hypermultiplets to all orders in the fermi fields, without taking into account the anomalous couplings. The coupling of vector multiplets to an arbitrary number of tensor multiplets was obtained to lowest order in the fermi fields in [25] in the covariant formulation and in [26] in the consistent formulation, and these results have been generalized in [27, 28] to all orders in the fermi fields. Additional couplings to hypermultiplets have been included in [32], and in [29] the complete coupling of supergravity to vector, tensor and hypermultiplets has been obtained. In order to describe the supersymmetric part of the model of [4], let us briefly review these results, taking into account only the lowest order fermi terms.

We first summarize the field content of the multiplets. The gravitational multiplet contains the vielbein ${e_\mu}^m$, a 2-form and a left-handed gravitino ψ^A_μ, the tensor multiplet contains a 2-form, a scalar and a right-handed tensorino, the vector multiplet from the 9-9 sector contains a vector $A^{(9)}_\mu$ and a left-handed gaugino $\lambda^{(9)A}$, and finally the hypermultiplet contains four scalars and a right-handed hyperino. In the presence of n_T tensor multiplets, the tensorinos are denoted by χ^{MA}, where $M = 1, ..., n_T$ is an $SO(n_T)$ index. The index $A = 1, 2$ is in the fundamental representation of $USp(2)$, and the gravitino, the tensorinos and the gauginos are $USp(2)$ doublets satisfying the symplectic-Majorana condition

$$\psi^A = \epsilon^{AB} C \bar{\psi}^T_B \quad . \tag{4.1}$$

The n_T scalars in the tensor multiplets parametrize the coset $SO(1, n_T)/SO(n_T)$, while the $(n_T + 1)$ 2-forms from the gravitational and tensor multiplets are collectively denoted by $B^r_{\mu\nu}$, with $r = 0, ..., n_T$ valued in the fundamental representation of $SO(1, n_T)$, and their field-strengths satisfy (anti)self-duality conditions. Finally, taking into account n_H hypermultiplets, the hyperinos are denoted by Ψ^a, where $a = 1, ..., 2n_H$ is a $USp(2n_H)$ index, and the symplectic-Majorana condition for these spinors is

$$\Psi^a = \Omega^{ab} C \bar{\Psi}^T_b \quad , \tag{4.2}$$

where Ω^{ab} is the antisymmetric invariant tensor of $USp(2n_H)$ (see ref. [29] for more details).

The scalars $\Phi^{\bar{\alpha}}$ ($\bar{\alpha} = 1, ..., n_T$) in the tensor multiplets can be described, following [35], in terms of the $SO(1, n_T)$ matrix

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} v_r \\ x^M_r \end{pmatrix} \quad , \tag{4.3}$$

whose elements are functions of $\Phi^{\bar{\alpha}}$ satisfying the constraints

$$v^r v_r = 1 \quad , \qquad v_r v_s - x_r^M x_s^M = \eta_{rs} \quad , \qquad v^r x_r^M = 0 \quad . \tag{4.4}$$

The vielbein $V_{\bar{\alpha}}^M$ of the internal manifold is related to v^r and x^{Mr} by

$$V_{\bar{\alpha}}^M = v^r \partial_{\bar{\alpha}} x_r^M \quad , \tag{4.5}$$

where $\partial_{\bar{\alpha}} = \partial/\partial\Phi^{\bar{\alpha}}$. The metric of the internal manifold is $g_{\bar{\alpha}\bar{\beta}} = V_{\bar{\alpha}}^M V_{\bar{\beta}}^M$.

The hyper-scalars ϕ^α ($\alpha = 1, ..., 4n_H$) are coordinates of a quaternionic manifold, that is a manifold whose holonomy group is contained in $USp(2) \times USp(2n_H)$. In the model of [4], the hypermultiplets in the closed sector are neutral, while the hypermultiplets in the 9-9 sector are charged under the gauge group $SO(16) \times SO(16)$, that corresponds to an isometry of the manifold parametrized by the hyper-scalars. We denote by $V_\alpha^{aA}(\phi)$ the vielbein of the quaternionic manifold, where the index structure corresponds to the requirement that the holonomy be contained in $USp(2) \times USp(2n_H)$. The internal $USp(2)$ and $USp(2n_H)$ connections are then denoted, respectively, by $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha}{}^A{}_B$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha}{}^a{}_b$, that in our conventions are anti-hermitian matrices. The index $\alpha = 1, ..., 4n_H$ is a curved index on the quaternionic manifold, while the field-strengths of the connections are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{\alpha\beta}{}^A{}_B &= \partial_\alpha \mathcal{A}_{\beta}{}^A{}_B - \partial_\beta \mathcal{A}_{\alpha}{}^A{}_B + [\mathcal{A}_\alpha, \mathcal{A}_\beta]^A{}_B \quad , \\ \mathcal{F}_{\alpha\beta}{}^a{}_b &= \partial_\alpha \mathcal{A}_{\beta}{}^a{}_b - \partial_\beta \mathcal{A}_{\alpha}{}^a{}_b + [\mathcal{A}_\alpha, \mathcal{A}_\beta]^a{}_b \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

where $\partial_\alpha = \partial/\partial\phi^\alpha$. The condition that the vielbein $V_\alpha^{aA}(\phi)$ be covariantly constant gives the relations [36]

$$\begin{aligned} & V_{aA}^\alpha V_{bB}^\beta g_{\alpha\beta} = \Omega_{ab}\epsilon_{AB} \quad , \\ & V_{aA}^\alpha V^{\beta bA} + V_{aA}^\beta V^{\alpha bA} = \frac{1}{n_H} g^{\alpha\beta}\delta_a^b \quad , \\ & V_{aA}^\alpha V^{\beta aB} + V_{aA}^\beta V^{\alpha aB} = g^{\alpha\beta}\delta_A^B \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

where Ω_{ab} is the antisymmetric invariant tensor of $USp(2n_H)$. The field-strength of the $USp(2)$ connection $\mathcal{A}_{\alpha}{}^A{}_B$ is naturally constructed in terms of V_α^{aA} by the relation

$$\mathcal{F}_{\alpha\beta AB} = V_{\alpha aA} V_{\beta}{}^a{}_B + V_{\alpha aB} V_{\beta}{}^a{}_A \quad , \tag{4.8}$$

and then the cyclic identity for the internal curvature tensor implies that the field-strength of the $USp(2n_H)$ connection $\mathcal{A}^a_{\alpha b}$ has the form

$$\mathcal{F}_{\alpha\beta ab} = V_{\alpha aA} V_{\beta b}{}^{A} + V_{\alpha bA} V_{\beta a}{}^{A} + \Omega_{abcd} V_\alpha^{dA} V^c_{\beta\, A} \quad , \tag{4.9}$$

where Ω_{abcd} is totally symmetric in its indices [36].

Denoting with $A^{(9)i}_\mu$ the gauge fields under which the hypermultiplets are charged (the index i runs in the adjoint of the gauge group), under the gauge transformations

$$\delta A^{(9)i}_\mu = D_\mu \Lambda^{(9)i} \tag{4.10}$$

the scalars transform as

$$\delta \phi^\alpha = \Lambda^{(9)i} \xi^{\alpha i} \quad , \tag{4.11}$$

where $\xi^{\alpha i}$ are the Killing vectors corresponding to the isometry that we are gauging. The covariant derivative for the scalars is then

$$D_\mu \phi^\alpha = \partial_\mu \phi^\alpha - A^{(9)i}_\mu \xi^{\alpha i} \quad . \tag{4.12}$$

One can correspondingly define the covariant derivatives for the spinors in a natural way, adding the composite connections $D_\mu \phi^\alpha \mathcal{A}_\alpha$. For instance, the covariant derivative for the hyperinos Ψ^a will contain the connections $D_\mu \phi^\alpha \mathcal{A}^a_{\alpha b}$, while the covariant derivative for the gravitino and the tensorinos will contain the connections $D_\mu \phi^\alpha \mathcal{A}^A_{\alpha\, B}$. The covariant derivatives for the gauginos $\lambda^{(9)iA}$ are

$$D_\mu \lambda^{(9)iA} = \partial_\mu \lambda^{(9)iA} + \frac{1}{4} \omega_{\mu mn} \gamma^{mn} \lambda^{(9)iA} + D_\mu \phi^\alpha \mathcal{A}^A_{\alpha\, B} \lambda^{(9)iB} + f^{ijk} A^{(9)j}_\mu \lambda^{(9)kA} \quad , \tag{4.13}$$

where f^{ijk} are the structure constants of the group.

We use the method of Pasti, Sorokin and Tonin (PST) [31] in order to write a covariant action for fields that satisfy self-duality conditions. For a self-dual 3-form in six dimensions the PST action

$$\mathcal{L}_{PST} = \frac{1}{12} H_{\mu\nu\rho} H^{\mu\nu\rho} - \frac{1}{4} \frac{\partial^\mu \Xi \partial^\sigma \Xi}{(\partial \Xi)^2} H^-_{\mu\nu\rho} H_\sigma^{-\nu\rho} \quad , \tag{4.14}$$

where $H^- = H - {*H}$ and Ξ is a scalar auxiliary field, is invariant under the standard gauge transformations for a 2-form,

$$\delta B = d\Lambda, \tag{4.15}$$

and under the additional PST gauge transformations

$$\delta B_{\mu\nu} = (\partial_\mu \Xi)\Lambda_\nu - (\partial_\nu \Xi)\Lambda_\mu \tag{4.16}$$

and

$$\delta \Xi = \Lambda \quad , \qquad \delta B_{\mu\nu} = \frac{\Lambda}{(\partial \Xi)^2} H^{-}_{\mu\nu\rho} \partial^\rho \Xi \quad . \tag{4.17}$$

Fixing the PST gauge in an appropriate way, one ends up with a self-dual 3-form, after eliminating the auxiliary scalar. It should be observed that this gauge choice can not be imposed directly on the Lagrangian, not defined if $\Xi = 0$.

This method has already been applied to a number of systems, including $(1,0)$ six-dimensional supergravity coupled to tensor multiplets [37] and type-IIB ten-dimensional supergravity [38], whose (local) gravitational anomaly has been shown to reproduce [39] the well-known results [40] of Alvarez-Gaumé and Witten. Here we use the results of [37], as well as those of [41, 29], in which the same construction has been applied to the case with also vector multiplets and hypermultiplets.

We have a single self-dual 3-form and n_T antiself-dual 3-forms, where n_T is equal to 17 in the T^4/Z_2 model of [4]. These forms are obtained dressing with the scalars in the tensor multiplets the 3-forms

$$H^r = dB^r - c^{rz} \omega^{(9)z} \quad , \tag{4.18}$$

where the index z runs over the various semi-simple factors of the gauge group in the 9-9 sector, ω is the Chern-Simons 3-form and the c's are constants (we denote with $z = 1$ the group under which the hypermultiplets are charged). More precisely, the combinations

$$H_{\mu\nu\rho} = v_r H^r_{\mu\nu\rho} \tag{4.19}$$

and

$$H^M_{\mu\nu\rho} = x^M_r H^r_{\mu\nu\rho} \tag{4.20}$$

are respectively self-dual and antiself-dual [35], to lowest order in the fermi fields, although in the complete lagrangian these conditions are modified by the inclusion of fermionic bilinears. As in ten dimensions, the gauge invariance of H^r in eq. (4.18) implies that B^r vary as

$$\delta B^r = c^{rz} tr_z(\Lambda^{(9)} dA^{(9)}) \tag{4.21}$$

under gauge transformations.

To lowest order in the fermi fields, the Lagrangian describing the coupling of the supergravity multiplet to n_T tensor multiplets, vector multiplets and n_H hypermultiplets is

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{-1}\mathcal{L}_{susy} = & - \frac{1}{4}R + \frac{1}{12}G_{rs}H^{r\mu\nu\rho}H^s_{\mu\nu\rho} + \frac{1}{4}g_{\bar{\alpha}\bar{\beta}}\partial_\mu\Phi^{\bar{\alpha}}\partial^\mu\Phi^{\bar{\beta}} - \frac{1}{2}v_r c^{rz} tr_z(F^{(9)}_{\mu\nu}F^{(9)\mu\nu}) \\
& - \frac{\partial^\mu\Xi\partial^\sigma\Xi}{4(\partial\Xi)^2}[\mathcal{H}^-_{\mu\nu\rho}\mathcal{H}^{-\,\nu\rho}_{\sigma} + \mathcal{H}^{M+}_{\mu\nu\rho}\mathcal{H}^{M+}{}_{\sigma}{}^{\nu\rho}] - \frac{1}{8e}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\delta\tau}B^r_{\mu\nu}c^z_r tr_z(F^{(9)}_{\rho\sigma}F^{(9)}_{\delta\tau}) \\
& + \frac{1}{2}g_{\alpha\beta}(\phi)D_\mu\phi^\alpha D^\mu\phi^\beta + \frac{1}{4v_r c^{r1}}\mathcal{A}^A_{\alpha\,B}\mathcal{A}^B_{\beta\,A}\xi^{\alpha i}\xi^{\beta i} \\
& - \frac{i}{2}(\bar{\psi}_\mu\gamma^{\mu\nu\rho}D_\nu\psi_\rho) - \frac{i}{2}v_r H^{r\mu\nu\rho}(\bar{\psi}_\mu\gamma_\nu\psi_\rho) + \frac{i}{2}(\bar{\chi}^M\gamma^\mu D_\mu\chi^M) \\
& - \frac{i}{24}v_r H^r_{\mu\nu\rho}(\bar{\chi}^M\gamma^{\mu\nu\rho}\chi^M) + \frac{1}{2}x^M_r\partial_\nu v^r(\bar{\psi}_\mu\gamma^\nu\gamma^\mu\chi^M) - \frac{1}{2}x^M_r H^{r\mu\nu\rho}(\bar{\psi}_\mu\gamma_{\nu\rho}\chi^M) \\
& + \frac{i}{2}(\bar{\Psi}_a\gamma^\mu D_\mu\Psi^a) + \frac{i}{24}v_r H^r_{\mu\nu\rho}(\bar{\Psi}_a\gamma^{\mu\nu\rho}\Psi^a) - V^{aA}_\alpha D_\nu\phi^\alpha(\bar{\psi}_{\mu A}\gamma^\nu\gamma^\mu\Psi_a) \\
& + iv_r c^{rz} tr_z(\bar{\lambda}^{(9)}\gamma^\mu D_\mu\lambda^{(9)}) + \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}v_r c^{rz} tr_z[F^{(9)}_{\nu\rho}(\bar{\psi}_\mu\gamma^{\nu\rho}\gamma^\mu\lambda^{(9)})] \\
& + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}x^M_r c^{rz} tr_z[F^{(9)}_{\mu\nu}(\bar{\chi}^M\gamma^{\mu\nu}\lambda^{(9)})] - \frac{i}{12}c^z_r H^r_{\mu\nu\rho} tr_z(\bar{\lambda}^{(9)}\gamma^{\mu\nu\rho}\lambda^{(9)}) \\
& - \sqrt{2}V^{aA}_\alpha\xi^{\alpha i}(\bar{\lambda}^{(9)i}_A\Psi_a) + \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}\mathcal{A}^A_{\alpha\,B}\xi^{\alpha i}(\bar{\lambda}^{(9)i}_A\gamma^\mu\psi^B_\mu) \\
& + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\mathcal{A}^A_{\alpha\,B}\frac{x^M_r c^{r1}}{v_s c^{s1}}\xi^{\alpha i}(\bar{\lambda}^{(9)i}_A\chi^{MB}) \quad ,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

where $G_{rs} = v_r v_s + x^M_r x^M_s$, while

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mu\nu\rho} = v_r H^r_{\mu\nu\rho} - \frac{3i}{2}(\bar{\psi}_{[\mu}\gamma_\nu\psi_{\rho]}) - \frac{i}{8}(\bar{\chi}^M\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho}\chi^M) + \frac{i}{8}(\bar{\Psi}_a\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho}\Psi^a) \tag{4.23}$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}^M_{\mu\nu\rho} = x^M_r H^r_{\mu\nu\rho} + \frac{3}{2}(\bar{\chi}^M\gamma_{[\mu\nu}\psi_{\rho]}) + \frac{i}{4}x^M_r c^{rz} tr_z(\bar{\lambda}^{(9)}\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho}\lambda^{(9)}) \tag{4.24}$$

satisfy on-shell self-duality and antiself-duality conditions, respectively. Finally, Ξ is the PST auxiliary field.

Due to eq. (4.21), the Wess-Zumino term $B \wedge F \wedge F$ is not gauge invariant, and thus the variation of eq. (4.22) under gauge transformations produces the consistent gauge anomaly

$$\mathcal{A}_\Lambda = -\frac{1}{4}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\delta\tau} c_r^z c^{rz'} tr_z(\Lambda^{(9)}\partial_\mu A_\nu^{(9)}) tr_{z'}(F_{\rho\sigma}^{(9)} F_{\delta\tau}^{(9)}) \quad , \tag{4.25}$$

related by the Wess-Zumino conditions to the supersymmetry anomaly

$$\mathcal{A}_\epsilon = \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\delta\tau} c_r^z c^{rz'} [-\frac{1}{4} tr_z(\delta_\epsilon A_\mu^{(9)} A_\nu^{(9)}) tr_{z'}(F_{\rho\sigma}^{(9)} F_{\delta\tau}^{(9)}) - \frac{1}{6} tr_z(\delta_\epsilon A_\mu^{(9)} F_{\nu\rho}^{(9)})\omega_{\sigma\delta\tau}^{(9)z'}] \, , \tag{4.26}$$

that one can recover varying the Lagrangian of eq. (4.22) under the supersymmetry transformations

$$\begin{aligned}
&\delta e_\mu{}^m = -i(\bar\epsilon\gamma^m\psi_\mu) \quad , \\
&\delta B_{\mu\nu}^r = iv^r(\bar\psi_{[\mu}\gamma_{\nu]}\epsilon) + \frac{1}{2}x^{Mr}(\bar\chi^M\gamma_{\mu\nu}\epsilon) - 2c^{rz} tr_z(A_{[\mu}^{(9)}\delta A_{\nu]}^{(9)}) \quad , \\
&\delta\Phi^{\bar\alpha} = V^{\bar\alpha M}(\bar\chi^M\epsilon) \quad , \\
&\delta\phi^\alpha = V_{aA}^\alpha(\bar\epsilon^A\Psi^a) \quad , \\
&\delta\Xi = 0 \quad , \\
&\delta A_\mu^{(9)} = -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(\bar\epsilon\gamma_\mu\lambda^{(9)}) \quad , \\
&\delta\psi_\mu^A = D_\mu\epsilon^A + \frac{1}{4}K_{\mu\nu\rho}\gamma^{\nu\rho}\epsilon^A \quad , \\
&\delta\chi^{MA} = -\frac{i}{2}V_{\bar\alpha}^M\partial_\mu\Phi^{\bar\alpha}\gamma^\mu\epsilon^A + \frac{i}{12}K_{\mu\nu\rho}^M\gamma^{\mu\nu\rho}\epsilon^A \quad , \\
&\delta\Psi^a = i\gamma^\mu\epsilon_A V_\alpha^{aA}D_\mu\phi^\alpha \quad , \\
&\delta\lambda^{(9)A} = -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}F_{\mu\nu}^{(9)}\gamma^{\mu\nu}\epsilon^A \qquad (z \neq 1) \quad , \\
&\delta\lambda^{(9)iA} = -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}F_{\mu\nu}^{(9)i}\gamma^{\mu\nu}\epsilon^A - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}v_r c^{r1}}\mathcal{A}_\alpha^A{}_B\xi^{\alpha i}\epsilon^B
\end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$

where

$$K_{\mu\nu\rho} = \mathcal{H}_{\mu\nu\rho} - 3\frac{\partial_{[\mu}\Xi\partial^\sigma\Xi}{(\partial\Xi)^2}\mathcal{H}_{\sigma\nu\rho]}^- \tag{4.28}$$

and

$$K_{\mu\nu\rho}^M = \mathcal{H}_{\mu\nu\rho}^M - 3\frac{\partial_{[\mu}\Xi\partial^\sigma\Xi}{(\partial\Xi)^2}\mathcal{H}_{\sigma\nu\rho]}^{M+} \tag{4.29}$$

are *identically* self-dual and antiself-dual, respectively. In the complete theory, the anomalous terms would be exactly canceled by the anomalous contributions of fermion loops.

Following the same reasoning as for the ten dimensional case of [19], we can describe the couplings to non-supersymmetric matter requiring that local supersymmetry be non-linearly realized on the $\bar D5$-branes, and requiring that the supersymmetry variation of the non-supersymmetric fields be as in eq. (3.7). As explained in [19] and reviewed in the previous section, to lowest order in the fermions the coupling between the supersymmetric sector and the non-supersymmetric one is obtained dressing the bosonic fields in the supersymmetric sector with fermionic bilinears containing the goldstino, whose supersymmetry transformation is $\delta\theta = \epsilon$ to lowest order in the fermionic fields. As a result, the supersymmetry variation of the dressed scalars in the tensor multiplets

$$\hat{\Phi}^{\bar{\alpha}} = \Phi^{\bar{\alpha}} - V^{\bar{\alpha}M}(\bar{\theta}\chi^M) + \frac{i}{24} V^{\bar{\alpha}M} x^M_r H^r_{\mu\nu\rho}(\bar{\theta}\gamma^{\mu\nu\rho}\theta) \tag{4.30}$$

is a general coordinate transformation of parameter

$$\xi_\mu = -\frac{i}{2}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_\mu\epsilon) \quad . \tag{4.31}$$

This definition of $\hat{\Phi}$ then induces the corresponding dressing

$$\hat{v}^r = v^r - x^{Mr}(\bar{\theta}\chi^M) - \frac{i}{24} H^r_{\mu\nu\rho}(\bar{\theta}\gamma^{\mu\nu\rho}\theta) \quad , \tag{4.32}$$

and, in a similar fashion, the supersymmetry transformation of

$$\hat{\phi}^\alpha = \phi^\alpha - V^\alpha_{aA}(\bar{\theta}^A\Psi^a) - \frac{i}{2} V_{\beta aA} V^{\alpha aB}(\bar{\theta}^A\gamma^\mu\theta_B) D_\mu\phi^\beta \tag{4.33}$$

is again a coordinate transformation with the same parameter, together with an additional gauge transformation of parameter

$$\Lambda^{(9)} = \xi^\mu A^{(9)}_\mu \quad . \tag{4.34}$$

Similarly, the supersymmetry variation of

$$\hat{e}_\mu{}^m = e_\mu{}^m + i(\bar{\theta}\gamma^m\psi_\mu) - \frac{i}{2}(\bar{\theta}\gamma^m D_\mu\theta) - \frac{i}{8} v_r H^r_{\mu\nu\rho}(\bar{\theta}\gamma^{m\nu\rho}\theta) \tag{4.35}$$

contains also an additional local Lorentz transformation of parameter

$$\Lambda^{mn} = -\xi^\mu[\omega_\mu{}^{mn} - v_r H^{r\,mn}_\mu] \tag{4.36}$$

where ω denotes the spin connection. Since the scalars in the non-supersymmetric 9-$\bar{5}$ sector are charged with respect to the vectors in the 9-9 sector, we define also

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{A}^{(9)}_\mu &= A^{(9)}_\mu + \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_\mu\lambda^{(9)}) + \frac{i}{8} F^{(9)\nu\rho}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho}\theta) \quad (z \neq 1) \quad , \\
\hat{A}^{(9)i}_\mu &= A^{(9)i}_\mu + \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_\mu\lambda^{(9)i}) + \frac{i}{8} F^{(9)i\nu\rho}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho}\theta) + \frac{i}{4 v_r c^{r1}} \mathcal{A}^A_{\alpha\,B}\xi^{\alpha i}(\bar{\theta}_A\gamma_\mu\theta^B) \;,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.37}$$

whose supersymmetry transformation is a general coordinate transformation of parameter as in eq. (4.31), aside from a gauge transformation of parameter as in (4.34). If one requires that the supersymmetry variation of the vector $A^{(5)}_\mu$ from the non-supersymmetric $\bar{5}$-$\bar{5}$ sector be

$$\delta A^{(5)}_\mu = F^{(5)}_{\mu\nu} \xi^\nu \quad , \tag{4.38}$$

namely a general coordinate transformation together with a gauge transformation of parameter

$$\Lambda^{(5)} = \xi^\mu A^{(5)}_\mu \quad , \tag{4.39}$$

one obtains a supersymmetrization of the kinetic term for $A^{(5)}_\mu$ writing

$$-\frac{1}{2} \hat{e} \hat{v}^r c^w_r tr_w (F^{(5)}_{\mu\nu} F^{(5)}_{\rho\sigma}) \hat{g}^{\mu\rho} \hat{g}^{\nu\sigma} \quad , \tag{4.40}$$

where

$$\hat{g}_{\mu\nu} = \hat{e}_\mu{}^m \hat{e}_{\nu m} \quad , \tag{4.41}$$

and the index w runs over the various semi-simple factors of the gauge group in the $\bar{5}$-$\bar{5}$ sector. In analogy with the ten-dimensional case, the uncanceled NS-NS tadpole translates, in the low-energy theory, in the presence of a term

$$-\Lambda \hat{e} f(\hat{\Phi}^{\bar{\alpha}}, \hat{\phi}^\alpha) \quad , \tag{4.42}$$

that depends on the scalars of the closed sector and contains the dilaton, that belongs to a hypermultiplet in type-I vacua. Thus, supersymmetry breaking naturally corresponds in this case also to a breaking of the isometries of the scalar manifolds.

Denoting with S the scalars in the 9-$\bar{5}$ sector, charged with respect to the gauge fields in both the 9-9 and $\bar{5}$-$\bar{5}$ sectors, we define their covariant derivative as

$$\hat{D}_\mu S = \partial_\mu S - i \hat{A}^{(9)}_\mu S - i A^{(5)}_\mu S \quad , \tag{4.43}$$

so that the term

$$\frac{1}{2} \hat{e} (\hat{D}_\mu S)^\dagger (\hat{D}_\nu S) \hat{g}^{\mu\nu} \tag{4.44}$$

is supersymmetric, if again the supersymmetry transformation of S is a general coordinate transformation, together with a gauge transformation of the right parameters. As in the ten-dimensional case, if one considers terms up to quartic couplings in the fermionic fields, one does not have to supersymmetrize terms that are quadratic in the additional fermions from the non-supersymmetric $\bar{5}$-$\bar{5}$ and 9-$\bar{5}$ sectors. Denoting with $\lambda^{(5)}$ these fermions, the coupling of $\lambda^{(5)2}$ to the 3-forms is not determined by supersymmetry, and can only be determined by string considerations, as in [19].

The inclusion of additional non-supersymmetric vectors modifies H^r, that now includes the Chern-Simons 3-forms corresponding to these fields, so that eq. (4.18) becomes

$$H^r = dB^r - c^{rz}\omega^{(9)z} - c^{rw}\omega^{(5)w} \quad . \tag{4.45}$$

The gauge invariance of H^r then requires that

$$\delta B^r = c^{rw} tr_w(\Lambda^{(5)} dA^{(5)}) \tag{4.46}$$

under gauge transformations in the $\bar{5}$-$\bar{5}$ sector. Consequently, the supersymmetry transformation of B^r is also modified, and becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \delta B^r_{\mu\nu} &= i v^r (\bar{\psi}_{[\mu}\gamma_{\nu]}\epsilon) + \frac{1}{2} x^{Mr} (\bar{\chi}^M \gamma_{\mu\nu}\epsilon) \\ &- 2c^{rz} tr_z(A^{(9)}_{[\mu}\delta A^{(9)}_{\nu]}) - 2c^{rw} tr_w(A^{(5)}_{[\mu}\delta A^{(5)}_{\nu]}) \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{4.47}$$

The complete reducible gauge anomaly

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_\Lambda = &- \frac{1}{4}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\delta\tau}\{ c^z_r c^{rz'} tr_z(\Lambda^{(9)}\partial_\mu A^{(9)}_\nu) tr_{z'}(F^{(9)}_{\rho\sigma}F^{(9)}_{\delta\tau}) \\ &+ c^z_r c^{rw} tr_z(\Lambda^{(9)}\partial_\mu A^{(9)}_\nu) tr_w(F^{(5)}_{\rho\sigma}F^{(5)}_{\delta\tau}) \\ &+ c^w_r c^{rz} tr_w(\Lambda^{(5)}\partial_\mu A^{(5)}_\nu) tr_z(F^{(9)}_{\rho\sigma}F^{(9)}_{\delta\tau}) \\ &+ c^w_r c^{rw'} tr_w(\Lambda^{(5)}\partial_\mu A^{(5)}_\nu) tr_{w'}(F^{(5)}_{\rho\sigma}F^{(5)}_{\delta\tau})\} \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{4.48}$$

related by the Wess-Zumino conditions to the supersymmetry anomaly

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_\epsilon &= \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\delta\tau}\{ c^z_r c^{rz'}[-\frac{1}{4} tr_z(\delta_\epsilon A^{(9)}_\mu A^{(9)}_\nu) tr_{z'}(F^{(9)}_{\rho\sigma}F^{(9)}_{\delta\tau}) - \frac{1}{6} tr_z(\delta_\epsilon A^{(9)}_\mu F^{(9)}_{\nu\rho})\omega^{(9)z'}_{\sigma\delta\tau}] \\ &+ c^z_r c^{rw}[-\frac{1}{4} tr_z(\delta_\epsilon A^{(9)}_\mu A^{(9)}_\nu) tr_w(F^{(5)}_{\rho\sigma}F^{(5)}_{\delta\tau}) - \frac{1}{6} tr_z(\delta_\epsilon A^{(9)}_\mu F^{(9)}_{\nu\rho})\omega^{(5)w}_{\sigma\delta\tau}] \\ &+ c^w_r c^{rz}[-\frac{1}{4} tr_w(\delta_\epsilon A^{(5)}_\mu A^{(5)}_\nu) tr_z(F^{(9)}_{\rho\sigma}F^{(9)}_{\delta\tau}) - \frac{1}{6} tr_w(\delta_\epsilon A^{(5)}_\mu F^{(5)}_{\nu\rho})\omega^{(9)z}_{\sigma\delta\tau}] \\ &+ c^w_r c^{rw'}[-\frac{1}{4} tr_w(\delta_\epsilon A^{(5)}_\mu A^{(5)}_\nu) tr_{w'}(F^{(5)}_{\rho\sigma}F^{(5)}_{\delta\tau}) - \frac{1}{6} tr_w(\delta_\epsilon A^{(5)}_\mu F^{(5)}_{\nu\rho})\omega^{(5)w'}_{\sigma\delta\tau}]\} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{4.49}$$

is induced by the Wess-Zumino term

$$-\frac{1}{8}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\delta\tau} B^r_{\mu\nu} c^w_r tr_w (F^{(5)}_{\rho\sigma} F^{(5)}_{\delta\tau}) \quad . \tag{4.50}$$

It should be noticed that, as in the case of linearly realized supersymmetry, eqs. (4.48) and (4.49) satisfy the Wess-Zumino condition

$$\delta_\Lambda \mathcal{A}_\epsilon = \delta_\epsilon \mathcal{A}_\Lambda \quad , \tag{4.51}$$

since the explicit form of the gauge field supersymmetry variation plays no role in its proof. We expect that, to higher order in the fermions, the supersymmetry anomaly will be modified by gauge-invariant terms as in [27, 29]. From the definition of H^r, one can deduce the Bianchi identities

$$\partial_{[\mu} H^r_{\nu\rho\sigma]} = -\frac{3}{2} c^r_z tr_z (F^{(9)}_{[\mu\nu} F^{(9)}_{\rho\sigma]}) - \frac{3}{2} c^r_w tr_w (F^{(5)}_{[\mu\nu} F^{(5)}_{\rho\sigma]}) \quad . \tag{4.52}$$

We now want to determine the terms proportional to $F \wedge F$ containing the goldstino that one has to add for the consistency of the model. Unlike the ten dimensional case, where duality maps the 2-form theory with Chern-Simons couplings to the 6-form theory with Wess-Zumino couplings, in this case the low-energy effective action contains both Chern-Simons and Wess-Zumino couplings. First of all, we observe that for the quantity

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{B}^r_{\mu\nu} &= B^r_{\mu\nu} - i v^r (\bar{\psi}_{[\mu}\gamma_{\nu]}\theta) - \frac{1}{2} x^{Mr} (\bar{\chi}^M \gamma_{\mu\nu}\theta) - \frac{2i}{\sqrt{2}} c^{rz} tr_z [A^{(9)}_{[\mu} (\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\nu]} \lambda^{(9)})] \\ &+ \frac{i}{8} (\partial_\rho v^r)(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\mu\nu}{}^{\rho}\theta) + \frac{i}{8} x^{Mr} H^{M\rho\sigma}_{[\mu} (\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\nu]\rho\sigma}\theta) + \frac{i}{2} v^r (\bar{\theta}\gamma_{[\mu} D_{\nu]}\theta) \\ &- \frac{i}{4} c^{rz} tr_z [A^{(9)}_{[\mu} F^{(9)\rho\sigma}](\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\nu]\rho\sigma}\theta) - \frac{i c^{r1}}{4 v_s c^{s1}} \mathcal{A}^{A}_{\alpha\,B} \xi^{\alpha i} A^{(9)i}_{[\mu} (\bar{\theta}^A \gamma_{\nu]} \theta^B) \end{aligned} \tag{4.53}$$

the supersymmetry variation is a general coordinate transformation of the correct parameter, together with an additional tensor gauge transformation of parameter

$$\Lambda^r_\mu = -\frac{1}{2} v^r \xi_\mu - \xi^\nu B^r_{\mu\nu} \quad , \tag{4.54}$$

as well as PST gauge transformations of parameters

$$\Lambda^{(PST)r}_\mu = \frac{\partial^\sigma \Xi}{(\partial \Xi)^2} [v^r v_s H^{s-}_{\sigma\mu\rho} - x^{Mr} x^M_s H^{s+}_{\sigma\mu\rho}] \xi^\rho \tag{4.55}$$

and

$$\Lambda^{(PST)} = \xi^\mu \partial_\mu \Xi \tag{4.56}$$

and gauge transformations of the form (4.21) and (4.46) whose parameters are as in eq. (4.34) and (4.39). We should now consider all the terms proportional to $F \wedge F$ that arise, those directly introduced by the inclusion of the Chern-Simons 3-form for the fields in the $\bar{5}$-$\bar{5}$ sector, those originating from the consequent modification of the Bianchi identities, and finally those introduced by the variation of the Wess-Zumino term.

The end result is that the variation of all these contributions gives

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\mathcal{L} &= \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\delta\tau}\{-\frac{i}{4}v_r(\bar{\epsilon}\gamma_\mu\psi_\nu) + \frac{1}{8}x_r^M(\bar{\epsilon}\gamma_{\mu\nu}\chi^M)\}c^{rw}tr_w(F^{(5)}_{\rho\sigma}F^{(5)}_{\delta\tau}) \\ &- 2v_r c^{rw}tr_w(\delta A^{(5)}_\mu F^{(5)}_{\nu\rho})K^{\mu\nu\rho} - 2x_r^M c^{rw}tr_w(\delta A^{(5)}_\mu F^{(5)}_{\nu\rho})K^{M\mu\nu\rho} \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{4.57}$$

The first two terms are canceled by the goldstino variation in the additional couplings

$$\mathcal{L}' = \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\delta\tau}\{\frac{i}{4}v_r(\bar{\theta}\gamma_\mu\psi_\nu) - \frac{1}{8}x_r^M(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\mu\nu}\chi^M)\}c^{rw}tr_w(F^{(5)}_{\rho\sigma}F^{(5)}_{\delta\tau}) \quad , \tag{4.58}$$

where, however, the variations of the gravitino and the tensorinos produce additional terms. Some of these cancel the last two terms in eq. (4.57), while the remaining ones are canceled by the goldstino variation in

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}'' &= \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\delta\tau}\{-\frac{i}{32}\partial^\rho v_r(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho}\theta) - \frac{i}{8}v_r(\bar{\theta}\gamma_\mu D_\nu\theta) \\ &- \frac{i}{32}x_r^M K_\mu^{M\alpha\beta}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\nu\alpha\beta}\theta)\}c^{rw}tr_w(F^{(5)}_{\rho\sigma}F^{(5)}_{\delta\tau}) \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{4.59}$$

If one restricts the attention to terms up to quartic fermion couplings, no further contributions are produced. We can thus conclude that the non-linear realization of supersymmetry is granted by the inclusion of $\mathcal{L}'$ and $\mathcal{L}''$ in the low-energy effective action. From eq. (4.53) we also see that these two contributions can be written in the compact form

$$\mathcal{L}' + \mathcal{L}'' = -\frac{1}{4}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\delta\tau}B^{r\ extra}_{\mu\nu}c_r^w tr_w(F^{(5)}_{\rho\sigma}F^{(5)}_{\delta\tau}) \quad , \tag{4.60}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} B^{r\ extra}_{\mu\nu} = &- iv^r(\bar{\psi}_{[\mu}\gamma_{\nu]}\theta) - \frac{1}{2}x^{Mr}(\bar{\chi}^M\gamma_{\mu\nu}\theta) - \frac{2i}{\sqrt{2}}c^{rz}tr_z[A^{(9)}_{[\mu}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\nu]}\lambda^{(9)})] \\ &+ \frac{i}{8}(\partial_\rho v^r)(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\mu\nu}{}^\rho\theta) + \frac{i}{8}x^{Mr}K^{M\rho\sigma}_{[\mu}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{\nu]\rho\sigma}\theta) + \frac{i}{2}v^r(\bar{\theta}\gamma_{[\mu}D_{\nu]}\theta) \end{aligned} \tag{4.61}$$

coincides with the counterterm of B^r only if no 9-9 vectors are present.

We now want to interpret these non-geometric terms along the lines of Section 3. To this end, observe that, if no 9-9 vectors are present, eq. (4.60) is exactly twice the term that one should add to eq. (4.50) in order to geometrize the Wess-Zumino term, substituting B with $\hat{B}$. This means, roughly speaking, that half of the contribution in eq. (4.60) comes from the Green-Schwarz term, and half from the Chern-Simons couplings. This interpretation is in perfect agreement with self-duality, and thus in six dimensions there is no duality transformation that can give a fully geometric Lagrangian. If also 9-9 vectors are in the spectrum, no additional terms are produced in the lagrangian, in agreement with the fact that the additional terms of $\hat{B}^r$ in eq. (4.53) are not gauge invariant.

To resume, the Lagrangian for supergravity coupled to tensor multiplets, hypermultiplets and non-supersymmetric vectors is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} &= \mathcal{L}_{susy} - \frac{1}{2}\hat{e}\hat{v}^r c_r^w tr_w(F^{(5)}_{\mu\nu}F^{(5)}_{\rho\sigma})\hat{g}^{\mu\rho}\hat{g}^{\nu\sigma} - \Lambda\hat{e}f(\hat{\Phi}^{\bar{\alpha}},\hat{\phi}^{\alpha}) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\hat{e}(\hat{D}_\mu S)^\dagger(\hat{D}_\nu S)\hat{g}^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{8}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\delta\tau}B^r_{\mu\nu}c_r^w tr_w(F^{(5)}_{\rho\sigma}F^{(5)}_{\delta\tau}) \\ &- \frac{1}{4}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\delta\tau}B^{r\ \ extra}_{\mu\nu}c_r^w tr_w(F^{(5)}_{\rho\sigma}F^{(5)}_{\delta\tau}) \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{4.62}$$

Since the supersymmetry transformation of other non-supersymmetric fermions is of higher order in the fermi fields, at this level we can always add them in the construction, while the couplings that can not be determined by supersymmetry could in principle be determined by string inputs, as in [19].

Finally, it is important to observe that without 9-9 vectors, although the Lagrangian (4.62) is not completely geometric, the corresponding field equations are. Indeed, if one fixes the PST gauge in such a way that the 3-forms satisfy the standard (anti)self-duality conditions, the equation for the vector fields, up to terms quartic in the fermions, is

$$\begin{aligned}&\hat{e}D_\nu[\hat{v}^r c_{rw}F^{(5)}_{\rho\sigma}\hat{g}^{\mu\rho}\hat{g}^{\nu\sigma}] + \frac{1}{6}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\delta\tau}c_{rw}F^{(5)}_{\nu\rho}\hat{H}^r_{\sigma\delta\tau} \\ &+\frac{1}{12}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\delta\tau}c_{rw}F^{(5)}_{\nu\rho}c^{rw'}\omega^{(5)w'}_{\sigma\delta\tau} + \frac{1}{8}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\delta\tau}c_{rw}A^{(5)}_\nu c^{rw'}tr_{w'}(F^{(5)}_{\rho\sigma}F^{(5)}_{\delta\tau}) = 0 \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{4.63}$$

where

$$\hat{H}^r_{\mu\nu\rho} = 3\partial_{[\mu}\hat{B}^r_{\nu\rho]} - c^r_w \omega^{(5)w}_{\mu\nu\rho} \quad , \tag{4.64}$$

and this is nicely of geometric form. It should be noticed that no additional counterterms containing the goldstino have to be added if also 9-9 vectors are present. In fact, all the terms in $\hat{B}^r$ induced by $A^{(9)}$ are not gauge invariant, and their inclusion in the lagrangian is forbidden because it would modify the gauge anomaly. The resulting equation for $A^{(5)}$ is then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{e} D_\nu[\hat{v}^r c_{rw} F^{(5)}_{\rho\sigma} \hat{g}^{\mu\rho} \hat{g}^{\nu\sigma}] + \frac{1}{6}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\delta\tau} c_{rw} F^{(5)}_{\nu\rho} \tilde{H}^r_{\sigma\delta\tau} \\
&+\frac{1}{12}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\delta\tau} c_{rw} F^{(5)}_{\nu\rho} c^{rz} \omega^{(9)z}_{\sigma\delta\tau} + \frac{1}{8}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\delta\tau} c_{rw} A^{(5)}_\nu c^{rz} tr_z(F^{(9)}_{\rho\sigma} F^{(9)}_{\delta\tau}) \\
&+\frac{1}{12}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\delta\tau} c_{rw} F^{(5)}_{\nu\rho} c^{rw'} \omega^{(5)w'}_{\sigma\delta\tau} + \frac{1}{8}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\delta\tau} c_{rw} A^{(5)}_\nu c^{rw'} tr_{w'}(F^{(5)}_{\rho\sigma} F^{(5)}_{\delta\tau}) = 0 \quad ,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.65}$$

where

$$\tilde{H}^r_{\mu\nu\rho} = 3\partial_{[\mu}B^r_{\nu\rho]} + 3\partial_{[\mu}B^r_{\nu\rho]}{}^{extra} - c^{rz}\omega^{(9)z}_{\mu\nu\rho} - c^{rw}\omega^{(5)w}_{\mu\nu\rho} \tag{4.66}$$

is geometric up to gauge-invariant terms proportional to c^{rz}. The result is thus in agreement with what expected by anomaly considerations. If gauge and supersymmetry anomalies are absent, the $A^{(5)}$ equation is mapped into itself by supersymmetry: this is the very reason why this equation is geometric. In the presence of gauge and supersymmetry anomalies, as long as 9-9 vectors are absent, the equation for $A^{(5)}$ is still geometric, albeit not gauge invariant. The supersymmetry anomaly, in this case, results from the gauge transformation contained in eq. (4.38). When also 9-9 vectors are present, these arguments do not apply, and thus in eq. (4.65) the geometric structure is violated by terms proportional to $c^{rz}c^w_r$.

The consistent formulation described above can be reverted to a supersymmetric formulation in terms of covariant non-integrable field equations [25, 28], that embody the corresponding covariant gauge anomaly

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}^{cov}_\Lambda &= \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\delta\tau}[c^{rz}c^{z'}_r tr_z(\Lambda^{(9)}F^{(9)}_{\mu\nu})tr_{z'}(F^{(9)}_{\rho\sigma}F^{(9)}_{\delta\tau}) \\
&+ c^{rz}c^w_r tr_z(\Lambda^{(9)}F^{(9)}_{\mu\nu})tr_w(F^{(5)}_{\rho\sigma}F^{(5)}_{\delta\tau}) \\
&+ c^{rw}c^z_r tr_w(\Lambda^{(5)}F^{(5)}_{\mu\nu})tr_z(F^{(9)}_{\rho\sigma}F^{(9)}_{\delta\tau})
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ \quad c^{rw} c_r^{w'} tr_w(\Lambda^{(5)} F^{(5)}_{\mu\nu}) tr_{w'}(F^{(5)}_{\rho\sigma} F^{(5)}_{\delta\tau})] \quad , \tag{4.67}$$

given by the divergence of the covariant equation for $A^{(5)}_\mu$,

$$\hat{e} D_\nu [\hat{v}^r c_{rw} F^{(5)}_{\rho\sigma} \hat{g}^{\mu\rho} \hat{g}^{\nu\sigma}] + \frac{1}{6} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\alpha\beta\gamma} c_{rw} F^{(5)}_{\nu\rho} \tilde{H}^r_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = 0 \quad , \tag{4.68}$$

and the divergence of the covariant equation for $A^{(9)}_\mu$ [28]. Without 9-9 vectors, eq. (4.68) is both geometric and gauge-covariant, while, if 9-9 vectors are present, the geometric structure is violated by gauge-covariant terms proportional again to $c^{rz} c_r^w$.

5 Conclusions

In this paper we have extended the results of [19] on the low-energy effective action for models with brane supersymmetry breaking. In this class of models a supersymmetric bulk is coupled to a non-supersymmetric open sector, and as a result local supersymmetry is non-linearly realized *à la* Volkov-Akulov. In particular, we have shown that, up to quartic order in the fermions, the low-energy couplings between the supersymmetric bulk and the non-supersymmetric open sector in the ten-dimensional $USp(32)$ model of [3] are *all* of geometric origin, being induced by the dressing of the bulk fields in terms of the goldstino, provided one turns to the dual 6-form [23] formulation. Thus, in retrospect, the non-geometric terms in [19] are precisely what is needed to geometrize the dual form of the theory, where the (high-derivative) Chern-Simons couplings are absent. We have completed a similar construction for six-dimensional models with brane supersymmetry breaking. Since in this case both Chern-Simons and Wess-Zumino terms are simultaneously present, not all couplings in the Lagrangian can be related to goldstino-dependent dressings of bulk fields. However, in the absence of supersymmetric vectors, the field equations exhibit this geometric structure, that is naturally violated in the general case by anomalous terms.

It would be interesting to apply the same construction to the four-dimensional brane supersymmetry breaking models of [4], and in general to brane-world scenarios (see [2] and references therein) in which supersymmetry is linearly realized in the gravitational sector and non-linearly realized in the brane universe. However, in four dimensions the gravitino can acquire a Majorana mass through a super-Higgs mechanism [42], and it is this difference with respect to minimal supergravity in ten and six dimensions that makes the models studied in this paper rather peculiar.

A general property of all this class of models is the presence of a dilaton tadpole of positive sign, required in order to have a correct kinetic term for the goldstino [19], and guaranteed by the residual tension of anti-branes and orientifolds. In ten dimensions the tadpole signals the impossibility of having maximally symmetric vacuum configurations [34], and one should try to analyze the same effects in the six-dimensional models discussed in this paper.

Finally, it should be observed that it is always possible, in any supersymmetric theory coupled to a goldstino, to dress the fields in the linear sector by terms containing the goldstino itself. This is a property of the commutator of two supersymmetries: by construction, a supersymmetry transformation on the dressed fields exactly corresponds to the commutator of two supersymmetries on the linear fields, producing general coordinate transformations together with all the other local symmetry transformations. In the six dimensional case discussed in Section 4, this can be explicitly verified: the parameters of eqs. (4.31), (4.34), (4.36), (4.54), (4.55) and (4.56) coincide with those coming from the supersymmetry algebra, provided one substitutes $-\frac{i}{2}(\bar{\theta}\gamma_\mu\epsilon)$ with $-i(\bar{\epsilon}_1\gamma_\mu\epsilon_2)$ [27, 29, 41]. Following this way of reasoning, one could try to generalize the results obtained here to all orders in the fermi fields.

Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to thank E. Dudas, M. Larosa, J. Mourad, Ya.S. Stanev and in particular A. Sagnotti, for many illuminating discussions. This work was supported in part by the EEC contracts HPRN-CT-2000-00122 and HPRN-CT-2000-00148, and by the INTAS contract 99-1-590.

References

[1] A. Sagnotti, ROM2F-87-25 *Talk presented at the Cargese Summer Institute on Non-Perturbative Methods in Field Theory, Cargese, France, Jul 16-30, 1987*; G. Pradisi and A. Sagnotti, Phys. Lett. B **216** (1989) 59; M. Bianchi and A. Sagnotti, Phys. Lett. B **247** (1990) 517; Nucl. Phys. B **361** (1991) 519; M. Bianchi, G. Pradisi and A. Sagnotti, Nucl. Phys. B **376** (1992) 365.

[2] For a review, see E. Dudas, Class. Quant. Grav. **17** (2000) R41 [hep-ph/0006190].

[3] S. Sugimoto, Prog. Theor. Phys. **102**, 685 (1999) [hep-th/9905159].

[4] I. Antoniadis, E. Dudas and A. Sagnotti, Phys. Lett. B **464** (1999) 38 [hep-th/9908023]; C. Angelantonj, Nucl. Phys. B **566** (2000) 126 [hep-th/9908064]; G. Aldazabal and A. M. Uranga, JHEP **9910** (1999) 024 [hep-th/9908072]; G. Aldazabal, L. E. Ibanez and F. Quevedo, JHEP **0001** (2000) 031 [hep-th/9909172]; C. Angelantonj, I. Antoniadis, G. D'Appollonio, E. Dudas and A. Sagnotti, Nucl. Phys. B **572** (2000) 36 [hep-th/9911081]; M. Bianchi, J. F. Morales and G. Pradisi, Nucl. Phys. B **573** (2000) 314 [hep-th/9910228]; C. Angelantonj, R. Blumenhagen and M. R. Gaberdiel, Nucl. Phys. B **589** (2000) 545 [hep-th/0006033].

[5] L. J. Dixon and J. A. Harvey, Nucl. Phys. B **274** (1986) 93; N. Seiberg and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B **276** (1986) 272.

[6] M. Bianchi and A. Sagnotti, in [1].

[7] D. Fioravanti, G. Pradisi and A. Sagnotti, Phys. Lett. B **321** (1994) 349 [hep-th/9311183]; G. Pradisi, A. Sagnotti and Y. S. Stanev, Phys. Lett. B **354** (1995) 279 [hep-th/9503207], Phys. Lett. B **356** (1995) 230 [hep-th/9506014], Phys. Lett. B **381** (1996) 97 [hep-th/9603097]. L. R. Huiszoon, A. N. Schellekens and N. Sousa, Phys. Lett. B **470** (1999) 95 [hep-th/9909114]; J. Fuchs, L. R. Huiszoon, A. N. Schellekens, C. Schweigert and J. Walcher, Phys. Lett. B **495** (2000) 427 [hep-th/0007174]. For reviews see: A. Sagnotti and Y. S. Stanev, Fortsch. Phys. **44** (1996) 585 [Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **55B** (1996) 200] [hep-th/9605042]; G. Pradisi, Nuovo Cim. B **112** (1997) 467 [hep-th/9603104].

[8] A. Sagnotti, hep-th/9509080, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **56B** (1997) 332 [hep-th/9702093].

[9] C. Angelantonj, Phys. Lett. B **444** (1998) 309 [hep-th/9810214]; R. Blumenhagen, A. Font and D. Lust, Nucl. Phys. B **558** (1999) 159 [hep-th/9904069]; R. Blumenhagen and A. Kumar, Phys. Lett. B **464** (1999) 46 [hep-th/9906234]; K. Forger, Phys. Lett. B **469** (1999) 113 [hep-th/9909010].

[10] E. Dudas and J. Mourad, Nucl. Phys. B **598**, 189 (2001) [hep-th/0010179].

[11] J. Scherk and J. H. Schwarz, Nucl. Phys. B **153** (1979) 61.

[12] R. Rohm, Nucl. Phys. B **237** (1984) 553; S. Ferrara, C. Kounnas and M. Porrati, Phys. Lett. B **181** (1986) 263, Nucl. Phys. B **304** (1988) 500, Phys. Lett. B **206** (1988) 25; I. Antoniadis, C. Bachas, D. C. Lewellen and T. N. Tomaras, Phys. Lett. B **207**, 441 (1988); C. Kounnas and M. Porrati, Nucl. Phys. B **310** (1988) 355; S. Ferrara, C. Kounnas, M. Porrati and F. Zwirner, Nucl. Phys. B **318** (1989) 75; C. Kounnas and B. Rostand, Nucl. Phys. B **341** (1990) 641; I. Antoniadis, Phys. Lett. B **246**, 377 (1990); I. Antoniadis and C. Kounnas, Phys. Lett. B **261** (1991) 369; E. Kiritsis and C. Kounnas, Nucl. Phys. B **503** (1997) 117 [hep-th/9703059].

[13] I. Antoniadis, E. Dudas and A. Sagnotti, Nucl. Phys. B **544** (1999) 469 [hep-th/9807011]; I. Antoniadis, G. D'Appollonio, E. Dudas and A. Sagnotti, Nucl. Phys. B **553** (1999) 133 [hep-th/9812118]; Nucl. Phys. B **565** (2000) 123 [hep-th/9907184]; R. Blumenhagen and L. Gorlich, Nucl. Phys. B **551** (1999) 601 [hep-th/9812158]; C. Angelantonj, I. Antoniadis and K. Forger, Nucl. Phys. B **555** (1999) 116 [hep-th/9904092]; A. L. Cotrone, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **14** (1999) 2487 [hep-th/9909116].

[14] E. S. Fradkin and A. A. Tseytlin, Phys. Lett. B **158** (1985) 316; A. Abouelsaood, C. G. Callan, C. R. Nappi and S. A. Yost, Nucl. Phys. B **280** (1987) 599.

[15] C. Bachas, hep-th/9503030.

[16] M. Berkooz, M. R. Douglas and R. G. Leigh, Nucl. Phys. B **480** (1996) 265 [hep-th/9606139]; V. Balasubramanian and R. G. Leigh, Phys. Rev. D **55** (1997) 6415 [hep-th/9611165].

[17] R. Blumenhagen, L. Gorlich, B. Kors and D. Lust, Nucl. Phys. B **582** (2000) 44 [hep-th/0003024], JHEP **0010** (2000) 006 [hep-th/0007024]; R. Blumenhagen, B. Kors and D. Lust, JHEP **0102** (2001) 030 [hep-th/0012156]; L. E. Ibanez, F. Marchesano and R. Rabadan, hep-th/0105155.

[18] C. Angelantonj, I. Antoniadis, E. Dudas and A. Sagnotti, Phys. Lett. B **489** (2000) 223 [hep-th/0007090]; C. Angelantonj and A. Sagnotti, hep-th/0010279.

[19] E. Dudas and J. Mourad, hep-th/0012071.

[20] D. V. Volkov and V. P. Akulov, Phys. Lett. B **46** (1973) 109; U. Lindstrom and M. Rocek, Phys. Rev. D **19** (1979) 2300; S. Samuel and J. Wess, Nucl. Phys. B **221** (1983) 153, Nucl. Phys. B **226** (1983) 289, Nucl. Phys. B **233** (1984) 488; J. Bagger and A. Galperin, Phys. Lett. B **336** (1994) 25 [hep-th/9406217].

[21] C. Angelantonj, R. Blumenhagen and M. Gaberdiel, in [4].

[22] G. Aldazabal, L. E. Ibanez, F. Quevedo and A. M. Uranga, JHEP **0008** (2000) 002 [hep-th/0005067]; G. Aldazabal, S. Franco, L. E. Ibanez, R. Rabadan and A. M. Uranga, JHEP **0102** (2001) 047 [hep-ph/0011132]; G. Aldazabal, S. Franco, L. E. Ibanez, R. Rabadan and A. M. Uranga, hep-th/0011073.

[23] A. H. Chamseddine, Phys. Rev. D **24**, 3065 (1981).

[24] E. Bergshoeff, M. de Roo, B. de Wit and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Nucl. Phys. B **195** (1982) 97; G. F. Chapline and N. S. Manton, Phys. Lett. B **120** (1983) 105.

[25] A. Sagnotti, Phys. Lett. B **294**, 196 (1992) [hep-th/9210127].

[26] S. Ferrara, R. Minasian and A. Sagnotti, Nucl. Phys. B **474**, 323 (1996) [hep-th/9604097].

[27] S. Ferrara, F. Riccioni and A. Sagnotti, Nucl. Phys. B **519**, 115 (1998) [hep-th/9711059]; F. Riccioni, Phys. Lett. B **474** (2000) 79 [hep-th/9910246].

[28] F. Riccioni and A. Sagnotti, Phys. Lett. B **436** (1998) 298 [hep-th/9806129].

[29] F. Riccioni, hep-th/0101074, to appear in *Nucl. Phys. B.*

[30] H. Nishino and E. Sezgin, Nucl. Phys. B **278**, 353 (1986).

[31] P. Pasti, D. Sorokin and M. Tonin, Phys. Rev. D **55** (1997) 6292 [hep-th/9611100].

[32] H. Nishino and E. Sezgin, Nucl. Phys. B **505**, 497 (1997) [hep-th/9703075].

[33] M. B. Green and J. H. Schwarz, Phys. Lett. B **149** (1984) 117; Phys. Lett. B **151** (1985) 21.

[34] E. Dudas and J. Mourad, Phys. Lett. B **486** (2000) 172 [hep-th/0004165]; R. Blumenhagen and A. Font, Nucl. Phys. B **599** (2001) 241 [hep-th/0011269];

[35] L. J. Romans, Nucl. Phys. B **276**, 71 (1986).

[36] J. Bagger and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B222** (1983) 1.

[37] G. Dall'Agata, K. Lechner and M. Tonin, Nucl. Phys. B **512**, 179 (1998) [hep-th/9710127].

[38] G. Dall'Agata, K. Lechner and M. Tonin, JHEP **9807** (1998) 017 [hep-th/9806140].

[39] K. Lechner, Nucl. Phys. B **537** (1999) 361 [hep-th/9808025].

[40] L. Alvarez-Gaume and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B **234** (1984) 269.

[41] F. Riccioni and A. Sagnotti, hep-th/9812042.

[42] E. Cremmer, B. Julia, J. Scherk, P. van Nieuwenhuizen, S. Ferrara and L. Girardello, Phys. Lett. B **79** (1978) 231; E. Cremmer, B. Julia, J. Scherk, S. Ferrara, L. Girardello and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Nucl. Phys. B **147** (1979) 105; E. Cremmer, S. Ferrara, L. Girardello and A. Van Proeyen, Nucl. Phys. B **212** (1983) 413.